THE MUNICIPALITY OF METROPOLITAN TORONTO

SWEAP

SOLID WASTE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT PLAN

Component 3: TECHNOLOGY EVALUATION

Discussion Paper No: ADDENDUM TO DOCUMENTS 3.5 A,B,C.

Title: EXTENSION OF PROCESS TO IDENTIFY CANDIDATE SITES (STEP 2) AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMPARATIVE EVALUATION PROCESS FOR STEP 3 OF THE SITE SELECTION PROCESS FOR A MATERIALS RECOVERY FACILITY (MRF), COMPOST FACILITY AND ENERGY FROM WASTE (EFW) FACILITY.

Date: JANUARY 16, 1991.

DEPARTMENT OF WORKS
SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT DIVISION

To comment on this document or to obtain a copy, contact:

SWEAP
Metropolitan Toronto
Works Department
439 University Avenue,
Toronto, Ontario
M5G 1Y8

(416) 392-4546 or 1-800-387-9200

91-02310/

Addendum to Document 3.5A
Site Selection Process
Materials Recovery Facility (MRF)

Extension of Process to Identify Candidate Sites (Step 2) and the Development of Comparative Evaluation Process For Step 3 of the Site Selection Process for a MRF

Prepared By:

Proctor & Redfern Limited
45 Green Belt Drive
Don Mills, Ontario
M3C 3K3

JANUARY 16, 1991

E.O. 90P21

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
A1.0	PURPOSE OF ADDENDUM	A1
A2.0	AMENDMENT OF STEP 2 CRITERIA	A1
A3.0	APPLICATION OF STEP 2 CRITERIA	A2
A4.0	AMENDMENT OF STEP 3 CRITERIA	A2
A5.0	APPLICATION OF STEP 3 CRITERIA	A3

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2A	Criteria for the Identification of Candidate Sites in Candidate Areas (i.e., Step 2)
Revised Table 2A	Criteria for the Identification of Candidate Sites in Candidate Areas (i.e., Step 2)
Table 2B	Criteria for The Identification of Candidate Sites From List of Willing Host Sites (i.e., Step 2)
Revised Table 2B	Criteria for the Identification of Candidate Sites From List of Willing Host Sites (i.e., Step 2)
Table 2C	Minimum Distances from Boundaries of Natural Environment Features
Table 3	Criteria for the Assessment of the Long List of Candidate Sites to Identify A Short List of Candidate Sites (i.e., Step 3)
Revised Table 3	Criteria for the Assessment of the Long List of Candidate Sites to Identify A Short List of Candidate Sites (i.e., Step 3)
Table 3A.1	Manner of Application of Step 3 Human Health and Safety Criteria to Identify the Short List of MRF Candidate Sites
Table 3A.2	Manner of Application of Step 3 Natural Environment Criteria to Identify Short List of MRF Candidate Sites
Table 3A.3	Manner of Application of Step 3 Social/Cultural Criteria to Identify Short List of MRF Candidate Sites
Table 3A.4	Manner of Application of Step 3 Economic/Financial Criteria to Identify Short List of MRF Candidate Sites
Table 3A.5	Manner of Application of Step 3 Technical Criteria to Identify Short List of MRF Candidate Sites

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES (CONT'D)

Table 3A.6	Manner of Application of Step 3 Legal/Jurisdictional Criteria to Identify Short List of MRF Candidate Sites

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure A1	New Step 3 Criteria Which Are Added in Revised Table 3
Figure A2	Step 3 Criteria in Table 3, Discussion Paper 3.5A Which Are Deleted in Revised Table 3

A1.0 PURPOSE OF ADDENDUM

This Addendum to Discussion Paper 3.5A[1] describes the additional criteria identified for use in Step 2 of the site selection process, the revised criteria to be used in Step 3 of the site selection process and the method that will be used to apply the revised Step 3 criteria. This Addendum should be read in conjunction with Discussion Paper 3.5A.

A2.0 AMENDMENT OF STEP 2 CRITERIA

The facility design assumptions for MRFs (Section 3.2.1, 3.2.2 Discussion Paper 3.5A) were intended to result in a facility with minimal impact on the natural environment. The criteria described on Table 2A and Table 2B in Discussion Paper 3.5A were based on this assumption. On reconsideration, it was decided that reliance on best available proven technology would not necessarily minimize adverse effects on all aspects of the natural environment. Therefore, additional Natural Environment criteria were identified to be used in Step 2. These criteria are included on Revised Table 2A and Revised Table 2B, included in this Addendum.

It was also decided that possible adverse effects arising from traffic entering and leaving the facility could be addressed by avoiding selecting sites that would require the use of streets having sensitive land uses (i.e. residential streets). Therefore, a new Step 2 criterion under Human Health and Safety was added to Revised Table 2A and Revised Table 2B, included in this Addendum. This criterion requires that Candidate Sites be located on streets which are designed for use by the heaviest amount of traffic (i.e. arterial roads). Within Metro, the new criterion focuses on Metro roads, because these roads are arterial in nature and may be more easily improved (e.g., widened, traffic signals, etc.) maintained or repaired by Metro since they are under the control of the Metropolitan Corporation. Outside Metro, the new criterion focuses on Regional, District or County Roads, King's Highways and

---

1. Discussion Paper 3.5A, Site Selection Process, Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) Sept. 1990

connecting link highways because these roads are similarly designed for the heaviest amount of traffic. The criterion also recognizes that, for a Candidate Site co-sited with a Metro landfill site, rail lines may be used to provide access to the MRF site.

The Social/Cultural criterion described on Table 2A and Table 2B of Discussion Paper 3.5A dealing with heritage and related features has been re-worked. The criterion included on Revised Table 2A and Revised Table 2B addresses the specific interests protected by the federal, provincial and municipal levels of government.

The Land Use criterion described on Table 2A and Table 2B has been expanded to encompass federal Indian reserves. This change is included on Revised Table 2A and Revised Table 2B.

A3.0 APPLICATION OF STEP 2 CRITERIA

All the criteria in Revised Table 2A and Revised Table 2B will be applied in Step 2 to all sites that satisfied the Step 1 criteria for the identification of Candidate Areas and the minimum site size guideline. The sites that satisfy the Step 2 criteria will constitute the long list of Candidate Sites for a MRF.

Some of the criteria on Revised Table 2A and Revised Table 2B involve the application of minimum distances from described features. These minimum distances are identified in Table 2C to this Addendum.

A4.0 AMENDMENT OF STEP 3 CRITERIA

The Step 3 criteria shown in Revised Table 3 include criteria not included in Table 3, Discussion Paper 3.5A. The reason for each addition is identified in Figure A1. The Revised Table 3 does not include certain criteria from Table 3, Discussion Paper 3.5A. The reason for each deletion is identified in Figure A2.

A5.0 APPLICATION OF STEP 3 CRITERIA

The objective of Step 3 is to produce a short list of Candidate Sites from a long list of Candidate Sites by assessing the relative advantages and disadvantages of establishing a facility at each of the Candidate Sites on the long list. The assessment uses the criteria set out on Revised Table 3.

Each Candidate Site on the long list will be assigned a rating of "advantage", "neutral" or "disadvantage" relative to each criterion shown on Revised Table 3A, applied in the manner described in Tables 3A.1 - 3A.6. The sites with the most "disadvantage" ratings will be eliminated, one at a time, until there is a reasonable number of reasonable sites or until there are no sites with "disadvantage" ratings. In the former case, these sites will constitute the short list of Candidate Sites. In the latter case, where there is more than a reasonable number of reasonable sites, sites with the most "neutral" ratings will be eliminated one at a time, until there is a reasonable number of reasonable sites or until there are no sites with "neutral" ratings. In the former case, these sites will constitute the short list of Candidate Sites. In the latter case, even where there remain more than a reasonable number of reasonable sites, these sites will constitute the short list of Candidate Sites because all remaining sites will have only "advantage" ratings and cannot be further assessed using Step 3 criteria.

TABLE 2A
CRITERIA FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF CANDIDATE SITES
IN CANDIDATE AREAS (I.E., STEP 2)

Criteria Category	Human Health and Safety	Natural Environment	Social/Cultural	Land Use	Economic/Financial	Technical	Legal/Jurisdictional
Criteria	o No Step2 Identification criteria	o Site must not fall into any Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest (ANSI's)	o Site must not include major features of known historical, heritage, cultural, architectural, or archaelogical value	o Site must not be in a designated conservation area, a federal, provincial or municipal park; or a designated floodplain (i.e. by Regulation Fill Line)	o No Step 2 Criteria	o Site must be of sufficient size to provide for MRF operating require-ments, including adeuqate buffer and screening area	o No Step 2 Criteria
Source of Information	o Secondary source information, zoning and official plan documents, aerial photographs, land assessments records, agency contacts, field investigations, interviews, published information						
Note	* The minimum distances boundaries of natural environment features are shown on Table 2C.					o Plans showing property boundaries and sketches of preliminary MRF plant layout	

Original Table 2A From Discussion Paper 3.5A

v4:d:wastemgt:eo90p21:mrforg2a.xls

REVISED TABLE 2A
CRITERIA FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF CANDIDATE SITES
IN CANDIDATE AREAS (I.E., STEP 2)

Criteria Category	Human Health and Safety	Natural Environment	Social/Cultural	Land Use	Economic/Financial	Technical	Legal/Jurisdictional
Criteria	Site must be located abutting: o a Metro road as defined by Metro by-law o a Regional, District or County road as designated on an Ontario Transportation Map, Series 1-7 o a King's Highway as designated on an Ontario Transportation Map, Series 1-7 o a connecting link highway as designated by MTO(1), or o a road connected to one of the aforementioned roads that is part of an industrial road system identified in an official plan or Site must be adjacent to a railway line and co-sited with a Metro landfill facility (proposed or existing)	Site must not be in: o a federally designated natural area as defined by Canadian Parks Service o a provincially designated natural area as defined by MNR (2) o a municipally designated natural area as defined in an official plan o a life science ANSI(3) as defined by MNR o an earth science ANSI as defined by MNR o a surface water body capable of being a cold or warm water fishery, identifiable on a National Topographic Series Map (Scale 1:50,000) o a natural resource area (gas, oil pool formations, mineral aggregate resources) as defined by MNR o a provincially (Class 1 and 2) or regionally (Class 3) significant wetland as defined by MNR, or o an area with endangered species as identified by MNR or Environment Canada and Site must be a minimum distance* from each of the above	Site must not include: o a feature of heritage value as designated in an official plan o a feature of historical or architectural value designated or listed by a municipality o a feature of historical value designated by Canadian Parks Service o a feature of archaeological value designated or listed by MCC(4), or o a feature owned or controlled by the Ontario Heritage	Site must not be in: o an Indian reserve as defined by DIAND(5) o a federal park as defined by Canadian Parks Service o a provincial park as defined by MNR o a municipal park as designated in an official plan o a conservation area as defined by a provincially designated conservation authority, or o a floodplain as defined by a Regulation Fill Line	o No Step 2 Criteria	o Site must be of sufficient size to provide for MRF operating requirements, including adequate buffer and screening area	o No Step 2 Criteria
Source of Information	o Secondary source information, zoning and official plan documents, aerial photographs, land assessments records, agency contacts, field investigations, interviews, published information					o Plans showing property boundaries and sketches of preliminary MRF plant layout	
Note	* Minimum distances from boundaries of natural environment features are shown on Table 2C. (1) Ontario Ministry of Transportation (2) Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources (3) Area of Natural and Scientific Interest (4) Ontario Ministry of Culture and Communication (5) Federal Department of Indian and Northern Affairs						

v4:d:wastemgt:eo90p21:mrfrev2a.xls

TABLE 2B
CRITERIA FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF CANDIDATE SITES
FROM LIST OF WILLING HOST SITES (I.E., STEP 2)

Criteria Category	Human Health and Safety	Natural Environment	Social/Cultural	Land Use	Economic/Financial	Technical	Legal/Jurisdictional
Criteria	o No Step 2 identification criteria	o Site must not fall into any Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest (ANSI's)	o Site must not include major features of known historical, heritage, cultural, architectural, or archaeological value	o Site must not be in a designated conservation area; a federal, provincial or municipal park; or a designated floodplain (i.e., by Regulation Fill Line), and o Site must be on: o Land which is zoned industrial or designated in an Official Plan as industrial, or o Land which is zoned agricultural or designated in an Official Plan as agricultural where such land is in the urban shadow, or o Land currently or formerly used for waste management purposes, or o Land where a municipal proponent of an offered site for a landfill facility requires that a MRF be provided on, or adjacent to the offered site, or o Any combination of the above	o No Step 2 identification criteria	o Site must be of sufficient size to provide for MRF operating requirements, including adequate buffer and screening area.	o No Step 2 identification criteria
Source of Information	o zoning and Official Plan documents, agency contacts and field investigations, if appropriate					o Plans showing property boundaries and sketches of preliminary MRF plant layout	

Original Table 2B From Discussion Paper 3.5A

v4:d:\wastemgt\eo90p21\mrfor2b.xls

REVISED TABLE 2B

CRITERIA FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF CANDIDATE SITES
FROM LIST OF WILLING HOST SITES (I.E., STEP 2)

Criteria Category	Human Health and Safety	Natural Environment	Social/Cultural	Land Use	Economic/Financial	Technical	Legal/Jurisdictional
Criteria	Site must be located abutting: o a Metro Road as defined by Metro by-law, o a Regional District or County Road as designated on an Ontario Transporation Map, Series 1-7, o a King's Highway as designated as an Ontario Transporation Map, Series 1-7, o a connecting link highway as designated by MTO(1), or o a road connected to one of the aforementioned roads that is part of an industrial road system identified in an official plan; or Site must be adjacent to a railway line and co-sited with a Metro landfill facility (proposed or existing)	Site must not be in: o a federally designated natural area as defined by Canadian Parks Service, o a provincially designated natural area as defined by MNR(2), o a municipally designated natural area as defined in an official plan, o a life science ANSI(3) as defined by MNR, o an earth science ANSI as defined by MNR, o a surface water body capable of being a cold or warm water fishery, identifiable on a National Topographic Series Map (scale 1:50,000), o a national resource area (gas oil pool formation, mineral aggregate resources) as defined by MNR, o a provincially (Class 1 and 2) or regionally (Class 3) significant wetland as defined by MNR, or o an area with endangered species as identified by MNR or Environment Canada and Site must be a minimum distance* from each of the above	Site must not include: o a feature of heritage value as designated in an official plan, o a feature of historical or architectural value designated or listed by a municipality, o a feature of historical value designated by Canadian Parks Service, o a feature of archaeological value designated or listed by MCC(4), or o a feature owned or controlled by the Ontario Heritage Foundation	Site must not be in: o an Indian reserve as defined by DIAND(5), o a federal park as defined by Canadian Parks Service, o a provincial park as defined by MNR, o a municipal park as designated in an official park, o a conservation area as defined by a provincially designated conservation authority, or o a floodplain as defined by Regulation Fill Line and Site must be on: o land which is zoned industrial or designated in an official plan as industrial, or o land which is zoned agricultural or designated in an official plan as agricultural where such land is in the urban shadow, or o land currently or formerly used for waste management purposes, or o land where a municipal proponent of an offered site for a landfill facility requires that a MRF be provided on, or adjacent to the offered site, or	o No Step 2 Criteria	o Site must be of sufficient size to provide for MRF operating requirements, including adequate buffer and screening area.	o No Step 2 Criteria
Source of Information	o Secondary source information, zoning and official plan documents, aerial photographs, land assessments records, agency contacts, field investigations, interviews, published information.					o Plans showing property boundaries and sketches of preliminary MRF plant layout	
Note	* Minimum distances from boundaries of natural environment features are shown on Table 2C. (1) Ontario Ministry of Transportation (2) Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources (3) Area of Natural and Scientific Interest (4) Ontario Ministry of Culture and Communications (5) Federal Department of Indian and Northern Affairs						

v4:d:\wastemgt\eo90p21\mrfrev2b.xls

Table 2C
Minimum Distances From Boundaries
of Natural Environment Features

Natural Environment Feature	Minimum Distance From Boundary of Natural Environment Feature to Property Boundary of Site
Provincially or federally designated natural area	190 m
Municipally designated natural area	190 m
Life science ANSI	190 m
Earth science ANSI	20 m
Surface water body capable of being a cold or warm water fishery	190 m
Natural resource area	20 m
Provincially (Class 1 & 2) and regionally (Class 3) significant wetlands	190 m
Areas with endangered species	190 m or distance required by provincial guideline, if greater than 190 m

The minimum distances in this table are based on the facility design assumptions for a MRF, which include a minimum distance of 10 m from the MRF site boundary to the MRF building. Thus, a distance of 190 m in this table results in a minimum distance of 200 m between the MRF building and the boundary of the applicable Natural Environment feature.

TABLE 3
CRITERIA FOR THE ASSESSMENT
OF THE LONG LIST OF CANDIDATE SITES TO
IDENTIFY A SHORT LIST OF CANDIDATE SITES (I.E., STEP 3)

Criteria Category	Human Health and Safety	Natural Environment	Social/Cultural	Economic/Financial	Technical	Legal/Jurisdictional
Criteria	o Effect of traffic changes in injury and non-injury traffic accident rates o Effect of noise, odour and dust	o Number, extent and significance of woodlots that would be cleared o Proximity to ANSI's o Proximity to designated flood plain areas (i.e., by Regulation Fill Line) o Proximity to environmentally sensitive areas o Proximity to natural resource areas (e.g. gas/oil pool formations, mineral aggregate resources)	o Number of businesses and residences that would be disrupted by a MRF on a Candidate Site o Number of businesses and residences that would be displaced by a Candidate MRF Site o Impact of a MRF related traffic upon areas adjacent to traffic routes o Proximity to major features of known historical, heritage, cultural, archaeological or architectural value o Proximity to potentially affected farming activities o Proximity to major recreational activities o Distance from adjacent sensitive land uses as defined by MOE	o Site acquisition cost o Distance of a Candidate MRF Site from the location of solid waste generation o Distance of Candidate MRF Site from an existing operating solid waste transfer station o Proximity of Provincial highways, Metro arterial roads, County or Regional roads to a Candidate Site o Length and cost of access road requiring construction/improvement to serve a MRF located on a Candidate Site	o Presence of underground and overhead facilities on a Candidate Site that may require displacement or elimination o Distance of a Candidate MRF Site to sanitary sewers, water supply, gas supply, electrical supply and stormwater disposal facilities and adequacy of those facilities in relation to demands on a MRF o Feasibility, means and cost of mitigation required to reduce or eliminate all constraints identified	o Degree of difficulty in obtaining approvals having regard for local by-laws, provincial and federal laws and policies
Source of information	o secondary source information, zoning and Official Plan documents, aerial photographs, land assessment records, agency contacts, field investigations, interviews, and published information					

Original Table 3 From Discussion Paper 3.5A

REVISED TABLE 3
CRITERIA FOR THE ASSESSMENT
OF THE LONG LIST OF CANDIDATE SITES TO
IDENTIFY A SHORT LIST OF CANDIDATE SITES (I.E., STEP 3)

Criteria Category	Human Health and Safety	Natural Environment	Social/Cultural	Economic/Financial	Technical	Legal/Jurisdictional
Criteria	o Effect of fugitive emissions (noise, odour, dust)	o Proximity to federally designated natural areas as defined by Canadian Parks Service o Proximity to provincially designated natural areas as defined by MNR o Proximity to municipally designated natural areas as defined in an official plan o Proximity to a life science ANSIs as defined by MNR o Proximity to surface water bodies capable of being cold or warm water fisheries, identifiable on a National Topographic Series Map (scale 1:50,000) o Proximity to provincially (Class 1 and 2) or regionally (Class 3) significant wetlands as defined by MNR o Proximity to areas with endangered species as identified by MNR or Environment Canada o Number, extent and significance of woodlots that would be cleared	o Number of businesses and residences that would be displaced by a Candidate MRF Site o Proximity to features of heritage value as defined in an official plan o Proximity to features of historical or architectural value designated or listed by a municipality o Proximity to features of historical value as designated by Canadian Parks Service o Proximity to features of archaeological value designated or listed by MCC o Proximity to features owned or controlled by the Ontario Heritage Foundation o Proximity to Indian reserves as defined by DIAND o Proximity to federal parks as defined by Canadian Parks Service o Proximity to provincial parks as defined by MNR o Proximity to municipal parks as designated in an official plan o Proximity to conservation areas as defined by a provincially designated conservation authority o Proximity to potentially affected farming activities o Proximity to sensitive land uses	o Site acquisition cost o Distance of a Candidate Site from an existing solid waste transfer station o Cost of mitigation required to reduce or eliminate all constraints identified	o Presence of underground and overhead facilities on a Candidate Site that may require displacement or elimination o Distance of a Candidate Site to sanitary sewers, water supply, gas supply, electrical supply and storm-water disposal facilities and adequacy of those facilities in relation to demands of a MRF	o Degree of difficulty in obtaining land use approvals having regard for local by-laws, provincial and federal laws and policies o Ease of site access for investigation purposes
Source of Information	o secondary source information, zoning and Official Plan documents, aerial photographs, land assessment records, agency contacts, field investigations, interviews, and published information					

v4:\d:\wastemgt\eo90p21\mrfrevt3.xls

TABLE 3A.1
MANNER OF APPLICATION
OF STEP 3 HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY CRITERIA
TO IDENTIFY SHORT LIST OF MRF CANDIDATE SITES

Human Health and Safety	Advantage	Neutral	Disadvantage	Rationale
(1) Effect of fugitive emissions (noise, odour, dust)	o Nearest residence is more than 490 m from site.	o Nearest residence is between 90 - 490 m from the site.	o Nearest residence is less than 90 m from the site.	o Distances of up to 90 m are judged equivalent to adjacent. In the absence of specific guidelines on minimum distance separation between MRFs and residences with respect to fugitive emissions, regard has been given to the following related MOE policies and guidelines: MOE (Central Region) document entitled "Buffers; Use and Design Guidelines", December 1981 states "Separation distance(s) of 90 to 300 m between residential buildings and medium industrial use buildings are considered acceptable minimums". MOE policy document No. 07-07, "Guidelines for Land Use on or near Landfills and Dumps" states "The most significant adverse environmental effects to be normally within 500 m of a fill area".
Source of Information	o Secondary source information, zoning and Official Plan documents, aerial photographs, land assessment records, agency contacts, field investigations, interviews and published information			
Note	o Distances shown are measured from the boundaries of the MRF Candidate Site. There is a 10 m buffer between the MRF and the boundary of the Candidate Site.			

TABLE 3A.2

MANNER OF APPLICATION

OF STEP 3 NATURAL ENVIRONMENT CRITERIA

TO IDENTIFY SHORT LIST OF COMPOST FACILITY CANDIDATE SITES

Natural Environment	Advantage	Neutral	Disadvantage	Rationale
(1) Proximity to federally designated natural areas as designated by Canadian Parks Service (2) Proximity to provincially designated natural areas as defined by MNR	o Site is more than 990 m from a provincially of federally designated natural area.	o Site is between 490-990 m from a provincially of federally designated natural area.	o Site is 190-490 m from a provincially or federally designated natural area.	o In the absence of specific guidelines on minimum distance separation between MRFs and natural environment features, regard has been given to the following MOE and MNR policies and guidelines: MOE (Central Region) document entitled "Buffers, Use and Design Guidelines", December 1981 states "Separation distance(s) of 90 to 300 m between residential buildings and medium industrial use buildings are considered acceptable minimums". MOE policy document No. 07-07, "Guidelines for Land Use on or near Landfills and Dumps" states "The most significant adverse environmental effects to be normally within 500 m of a fill area". MNR Management Guidelines (Heronries) suggest a minimal impact beyond 1000 m. This is the greatest distance separation required for a species that is not endangered and thus represents a very conservative standard.
(3) Proximity to municipally designated natural areas as designated in an official plan	o Site is more than 990 m from municipally designated natural area	o Site is between 490-990 m from municipally designated natural area	o Site is 190-490 m from municipally designated natural area	o As per (1)
(4) Proximity to life science ANSI's as defined by MNR	o Site is more than 990 m from a life science ANSI	o Site is between 490-990 m from life science ANSI	o Site is 190-490 m from a life science ANSI	o As per (1)
(5) Proximity to surface water bodies capable of being a cold or warm water fishery identifiable on a National Topographic Series Map (scale 1:50,000)	o Site is more than 990 m from edge of surface water	o Site is between 490-990 m from edge of surface water	o Site is 190-490 m from edge of surface water	o As per (1)
(6) Proximity to provincially (Class 1and 2) and regionally (Class 3) significant wetlands as defined by MNR	o Site is more than 990 m from wetland	o Site is between 490-990 m from wetland	o Site is 190-490 m from wetland	o As per (1)

Cont'd.....

TABLE 3A.2

MANNER OF APPLICATION

OF STEP 3 NATURAL ENVIRONMENT CRITERIA

TO IDENTIFY SHORT LIST OF MRF CANDIDATE SITES

Natural Environment	Advantage	Neutral	Disadvantage	Rationale
(7) Proximity to areas with endangered species as identified by MNR or Environment Canada	o Site is more than 990 m from area of endangered species except where an existing MNR guideline provides for a greater setback. In this circumstance an advantage would be a site outside the MNR guideline setback.	o Site is between 490-990 m from the area of endangered species, except where an existing MNR guideline provides for a greater setback. In this circumstance a site inside the MNR setback is judged excluded under Step 2 criteria.	o Site is 190-490 m from area of endangered species, except when an existing MNR guideline provides for a greater setback. In this circumstance a site inside the MNR setback is judged excluded under Step 2 criteria.	o As per (1)
(8) Number, extent and significance of woodlots to be cleared	o No woodlot to be partially or completely cleared.	o Any woodlot which must be cleared, in whole or in part, is not significant*	o Site requires partial or complete clearance of one or more significant* woodlots	o Significant* woodlots will contain relatively unaffected areas in the interior parts which are relatively unaffected by woodlot edge impacts.
Source of Information	o Secondary source information, zoning and Official Plan documents, aerial photographs, land assessment records, agency contacts, field investigations, interviews and published information			
Notes	o Distances shown are measured from the boundaries of the MRF Candidate Site. There is a 10 M buffer between the MRF and the boundary of the Candidate Site. * A significant woodlot is greater than 4 ha. in area and comprises later, more mature stages of plant succession and is over 75 years old.			

v4:d:\wastemgt\eo90p21\mrfta2.xls

TABLE 3A.3

MANNER OF APPLICATION
OF STEP 3 SOCIAL/CULTURAL CRITERIA
TO IDENTIFY SHORT LIST OF MRF CANDIDATE SITES

Social/Cultural	Advantage	Neutral	Disadvantage	Rationale
(1) Number of businesses and residences that would be displaced by a Canadidate MRF Site	o No business or residence displaced	o One business or residence displaced*	o More than one business or residence displaced*	o Since a MRF is a business, a MRF that replaces one business or residence is judged to be neutral. It is assumed at this time that an owner of a site, offered to Metro upon which there are any number of residences or businesses that will be displaced by the MRF, will have determined that "displacement" is not an issue (as far as the owner is concerned). Hence such a site will be rated as Advantage "no business or residence displaced".
(2) Proximity to features of heritage value as designated by an official plan	o Site is more than 490 m from feature	o Site is between 90 m and 490 m from feature	o Site is less than 90 m from feature	o Distances of up to 90 m from a feature are judged equivalent to adjacent. In the absence of specific guidelines on minimum distance seperation between MRFs and specific land uses, regard has been given to the following related MOE policies and guidelines: MOE (Central Region) document entitled "Buffers; Use and Design Guidelines", December 1981 states "Separation distance(s) of 90 to 300 m between residential buildings and medium industrial use buildings are considered acceptable minimums". MOE policy document No. 07-07, "Guidelines for Land Use on or near Landfills and Dumps" states "The most significant adverse environmental effects to be normally within 500 m of a fill area".
(3) Proximity to features of historical or architectural value designated or listed by a municipality	o Site is more than 490 m from feature	o Site is between 90 m and 490 m from feature	o Site is less than 90 m from feature	o As per (2)
(4) Proximity to features of historical value as designated by Canadian Parks Service	o Site is more than 490 m from feature	o Site is between 90 m and 490 m from feature	o Site is less than 90 m from feature	o As per (2)

[redacted]ABLE[redacted]

MANNER OF APPLICATION
OF STEP 3 SOCIAL/CULTURAL CRITERIA
TO IDENTIFY SHORT LIST OF MRF CANDIDATE SITES

Social/Cultural	Advantage	Neutral	Disadvantage	Rationale
(5) Proximity to features of archaeological value designated or listed by MCC	o Site is more than 490 m from feature	o Site is between 90 m and 490 m from feature	o Site is less than 90 m from feature	o As per (2)
(6) Proximity to features owned or controlled by the Ontario Heritage Foundation	o Site is more than 490 m from feature	o Site is between 90 m and 490 m from feature	o Site is less than 90 m from feature	o As per (2)
(7) Proximity to Indian reserves as defined by DIAND	o Site is more than 490 m from feature	o Site is between 90 m and 490 m from feature	o Site is less than 90 m from feature	o As per (2)
(8) Proximity to federal parks as defined by Canadian Parks Service	o Site is more than 490 m from feature	o Site is between 90 m and 490 m from feature	o Site is less than 90 m from feature	o As per (2)
(9) Proximity to provincial parks as defined by MNR	o Site is more than 490 m from feature	o Site is between 90 m and 490 m from feature	o Site is less than 90 m from feature	o As per (2)
(10) Proximity to municipal parks as designated in an official plan	o Site is more than 490 m from feature	o Site is between 90 m and 490 m from feature	o Site is less than 90 m from feature	o As per (2)
(11) Proximity to conservation areas as defined by a provincially designated conservation authority	o Site is more than 490 m from feature	o Site is between 90 m and 490 m from feature	o Site is less than 90 m from feature	o As per (2)
(12) Proximity to potentially affected farming activities	o Site is more than 490 m from boundary of nearest farm.	o Site is between 210 m and 490 m of boundary of nearest farm.	o Site is less than 210 m from boundary of nearest farm.	o As per (2). Regard has also been given to the OMAF*** Agricultural Code of Practice, 1976. The average calculation of minimum distance separation for standard livestock operations is approximately 220 m. Therefore any distance less than 220 m judged to be a Disadvantage.
(13) Proximity to sensitive land uses	o Site is more than 490 m from nearest sensitive land use. **	o Site is between 90 m and 490 m from nearest sensitive land use. **	o Site is less than 90 m from nearest sensitive land use. **	o As per (2)
Source of Information	o Secondary source information, zoning and Official Plan documents, aerial photographs, land assessment records, agency contacts, field investigations, interviews and published information			
Notes	o Distances shown are measured from the boundaries of the MRF Candidate Site. There is a 10 M buffer between the MRF and the boundary of the Candidate Site. * Does not apply to land offered to Metro - see rationale for (1) ** Sensitive land uses are defined as: cemeteries and educational, medical and residential uses. *** Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Food			

TABLE 3A.4
MANNER OF APPLICATION
OF STEP 3 ECONOMIC/FINANCIAL CRITERIA
TO IDENTIFY SHORT LIST OF MRF CANDIDATE SITES

Economic/Financial	Advantage	Neutral	Disadvantage	Rationale
(1) Site acquisition cost	o Below $1,000,000 per hectare.	o $1,000,000-$1,700,000 per hectare.	o Above $1,700,000 per hectare.	o General industrial land costs in Metro range from $1,000,000-$1,700,000 per hectare. Prime sites are more expensive. Land costs below Metro general industrial costs are judged to be an Advantage.
(2) Distance of a Candidate MRF Site from an existing solid waste transfer station	o Site is on or adjacent to existing solid waste transfer station site.	o Site is less than 5 km from an existing solid waste transfer station site.	o Site is more than 5 km from an existing solid waste transfer station site.	o Existing waste collection routes are oriented to existing solid waste transfer stations. Close proximity of MRF and transfer station location will minimize costs.
(3) Cost of mitigation required to reduce or eliminate all constraints identified	o Costs of mitigation up to $1 million.	o Costs of mitigation between $1-2 million.	o Costs of mitigation more than $2 million.	o Site is more economically attractive when mitigation costs are low. Costs of over 10% of cost of MRF judged Disadvantage.
Source of Information	o Secondary source information, zoning and Official Plan documents, aerial photographs, land assessment records, agency contacts, field investigations, interviews and published information			

TABLE 3A.6
MANNER OF APPLICATION
OF STEP 3 LEGAL/JURISDICTIONAL CRITERIA
TO IDENTIFY SHORT LIST OF MRF CANDIDATE SITES

Legal/Jurisdictional	Advantage	Neutral	Disadvantage	Rationale
(1) Degree of difficulty in obtaining land use approvals, having regard for local by-laws, provincial and federal laws and policies	o Site is industrially zoned and designated as industrial in the appropriate official plan, and there is no evidence as of December 15, 1990 of a municipal intention to change the permitted land use to a different designation, or site is located on provincial or federal land with no applicable land use constraints.	o Site is either industrially zoned or designated as industrial in the appropriate official plan and there is no evidence as of December 15, 1990 of a municipal intention to change the permitted land use to a different designation.	o Site is either not zoned and not designated as industrial in the appropriate official plan or there is evidence as of December 15, 1990 of a municipal intention to change the land use from the industrial designation to a different designation or site is located on provincial or federal land with an applicable land use constraint.	o Site on land where land use designation is close to the proposed use will experience less difficulty with approvals for land use designation changes.
(2) Ease of site access for site investigation purposes	o Metro owned surplus land or Metro Works controlled land.	o Land offered to Metro.	o Land other than Metro owned surplus land and Metro Works' controlled land or land offered to Metro.	o Access for investigation purposes is easier to acquire for Metro owned land and offered land.
Source of Information	o Secondary source information, zoning and Official Plan documents, aerial photographs, land assessment records, agency contacts, field investigations, interviews, and published information			

v4:\d:\wastemgt\eo90p21\mrfta6.xls

TABLE 3A.5
MANNER OF APPLICATION
OF STEP 3 TECHNICAL CRITERIA
TO IDENTIFY SHORT LIST OF MRF CANDIDATE SITES

Technical	Advantage	Neutral	Disadvantage	Rationale
(1) Presence of underground and overhead facilities on a Candidate MRF Site that may require displacement or elimination	o No utility facilities requiring relocation.	o Presence of two minor * utility facilities providing services to others requiring relocation.	o Site has three or more minor * utility facilities providing services to others requiring relocation; or site has one or more major * utility facilities providing services to others requiring relocation.	o Rerouting utility facilities providing services to others is costly and causes disruption to customers. Relocation of some major * utility facilities may not be reasonable or feasible.
(2) Distance of a Candidate MRF Site to sanitary sewers, water supply, gas supply, electrical supply and stormwater disposal facilities and adequacy of those facilities in relation to demands of a MRF	o Adequate services are within 0.5 km of site.	o Adequate services are within 2 km of site.	o Adequate services are more than 2 km from the site.	o Service connection costs are lower when the site is close to existing services o Upgrading of services adds to cost and complexity
Source of Information	o Secondary source information, zoning and Official Plan documents, aerial photographs, land assessment records, agency contacts, field investigations, interviews, and published information.			
Notes	o * Minor utility facilities are sewers up to 750 mm diameter, watermains up to 300 mm diameter, gas mains up to 300 mm diameter, electrical distribution systems up 100 kv, and telecommunication facilities for up to 1000 persons. o * Major utility facilities are oil pipelines and sewers, watermains, gas mains, electric distribution systems and telecommunication systems of larger capacity than minor systems.			

FIGURE A1
NEW STEP 3 CRITERIA WHICH ARE ADDED IN REVISED TABLE 3

Criterion		Rationale For Addition
Natural Environment		
(1)	Proximity to federally designated natural areas as defined by Canadian Parks Service	Added to be consistent with the Natural Environment criterion added to Revised Table 2A and Revised Table 2B.
(2)	Proximity to provincially designated natural areas as defined by MNR	See (1) above
(3)	Proximity to municipally designated natural areas as defined in an official plan	See (1) above
(3)	Proximity to surface water bodies capable of being warm or cold water fisheries identifiable on a National Topographic Series Map (scale 1:50,000)	See (1) above. This criterion also replaces the criterion in Table 3 entitled "Proximity to designated flood areas".
(4)	Proximity to a provincially (Class 1 and 2) or regionally (Class 3) significant wetland as defined by MNR	See (1) above
(5)	Proximity to areas with endangered species as identified by MNR or Environment Canada	See (1) above
Social/Cultural		
(1)	Number of businesses and residences that would be disrupted by a MRF on a Candidate Site	This criterion was to be applied by identifying the number of businesses located on the streets within 500 m of the site. It was concluded that traffic effects could be more effectively addressed by the Human Health and Safety criterion identified in Revised Table 2A and Revised Table 2B. A further analysis of business disruption will be carried out in Step 4 of the site selection process.
(2)	Proximity to features of heritage value as designated by an official plan	Added to be consistent with the Social/Cultural criterion added to Revised Table 2A and Revised Table 2B.

FIGURE A1 (Cont'd)
NEW STEP 3 CRITERIA WHICH ARE ADDED IN REVISED TABLE 3

Criterion		Rationale For Addition
Social/Cultural (Cont'd)		
(3)	Proximity to features of historical or architectural value designated or listed by a municipality	See (2) above
(4)	Proximity to features of historical value as designated by Canadian Parks Service	See (2) above
(5)	Proximity to features of archaeological value designated or listed by MCC	See (2) above
(6)	Proximity to features owned or controlled by the Ontario Heritage Foundation	See (2) above
(7)	Proximity to Indian reserves as defined by DIAND	Added to be consistent with the Land Use criterion added to Revised Table 2A and Revised Table 2B
(8)	Proximity to federal parks as defined by Parks Canada	See (7) above
(9)	Proximity to provincial parks as defined by MNR	See (7) above
(10)	Proximity to municipal parks as designated on an official plan	See (7) above
(11)	Proximity to conservation areas as defined by a provincially designated conservation authority	See (7) above
Economic/Financial		
(1)	Cost of mitigation required to reduce or eliminate all constraints identified	Removed from Technical, and modified to indicate only "cost", and added to Economic/Financial.

FIGURE A1 (Cont'd)
NEW STEP 3 CRITERIA WHICH ARE ADDED IN REVISED TABLE 3

Criterion	Rationale For Addition
Legal/Jurisdictional	
(1) Ease of site access for site investigation purposes	Added to recognise that a site search can be severely hampered (i.e. made longer and more expensive) if access for investigation purposes is not obtained in a timely manner.

FIGURE A2
STEP 3 CRITERIA IN TABLE 3, DISCUSSION PAPER 3.5A
WHICH ARE DELETED IN REVISED TABLE 3

Criterion		Rationale For Deletion
<u>Human Health & Safety</u>		
(1)	Effect of traffic changes on injury and non-injury accident rates	Addressed by the Human Health and Safety criterion in Revised Table 2A and Revised Table 2B. See section A2.0 of this Addendum.
(2)	Effect of noise, odour and dust	Replaced by Human Health and Safety criterion in Revised Table 3 entitled "Effect of fugitive emissions (noise, odour and dust)".
<u>Natural Environment</u>		
(1)	Proximity to earth science areas of natural and scientific interest (ANSI)	There is no expected impact from the MRF beyond the distance shown in Table 2C.
(2)	Proximity to designated flood plain areas	Replaced by the Natural Environment criterion for surface water capable of being a cold or warm water fishery in Revised Table 2A and Revised Table 2B.
(3)	Proximity to environmentally sensitive areas	Addressed by the Natural Environment criteria of "Proximity to provincially or federally designated natural area" and "Proximity to municipally designated natural area" in Revised Table 3.
(4)	Proximity to natural resource areas	There is no expected impact from the MRF beyond the distance shown in Table 2C.
<u>Social/Cultural</u>		
(1)	Number of businesses and residences that would be disrupted by a MRF on a Candidate Site	This criterion was to be applied by identifying the number of businesses located on the streets within 500 m of the site. It was concluded that traffic effects could be more effectively addressed by the Human Health and Safety criterion identified in Revised Table 2A and Revised Table 2B. A further analysis of business disruption will be carried out in Step 4 of the site selection process.

FIGURE A2 (Cont'd)
STEP 3 CRITERIA IN TABLE 3, DISCUSSION PAPER 3.5A, WHICH ARE DELETED IN REVISED TABLE 3

Criterion		Rationale For Deletion
Social/Cultural (Cont'd)		
(2)	Impact of MRF related traffic upon areas adjacent to traffic routes	This criterion was to be applied by identifying the number of businesses and residences located on the streets within 500 m of the site. It was concluded that traffic effects could be more effectively addressed by the Human Health and Safety criterion identified in Revised Table 2A and Revised Table 2B.
(3)	Distances from sensitive land uses as defined by MOE	Replaced by "Proximity to sensitive land uses". Reference to MOE was deleted since MOE has no definition of sensitive land uses.
(4)	Proximity to major recreational activities	In Revised Table 2A and Revised Table 2B, Land Use, sites within designated Indian reserves, conservation areas, or federal, provincial or municipal parks were eliminated. To ensure clarity and consistency in the criteria, this Table 3 criterion has been reworked in Revised Table 3 to include areas adjacent to Indian reserves, conservation areas and federal, provincial and municipal parks.
Economic/Financial		
(1)	Distance of Candidate MRF Site from the location of solid waste generation	This criterion will be addressed in Step 4 of the site selection process.
(2)	Distance of Candidate Site from an existing operating solid waste transfer station	Replaced by the Economic/Financial criterion "Distance of Candidate Site from existing solid waste transfer station," since such a facility can be assumed to be operating.
(3)	Proximity of provincial highways, Metro arterial roads, county or regional roads to a Candidate MRF Site	See rationale for (1) above.

FIGURE A2 (Cont'd)
STEP 3 CRITERIA IN TABLE 3, DISCUSSION PAPER 3.5A,
WHICH ARE DELETED IN REVISED TABLE 3

Criterion	Rationale For Deletion
Economic/Financial (Cont'd)	
(4) Length and cost of access road requiring construction/improvement to serve MRF located on Candidate Site	Within Metro access road requirements are expected to be minimal based on Revised Table 2A and Revised Table 2B, Human Health and Safety criterion. This is a comparative criterion and will be addressed in Step 4.
Technical	
(1) Feasibility, means and cost of mitigation required to reduce or eliminate all constraints identified	Replaced by Economic/Financial criterion. "Cost of mitigation required to reduce or eliminate all constraints identified". "feasibility" and "means" were deleted since the Environmental Assessment Act requires that means of mitigation be considered in assessing the advantages and disadvantages of potential sites. Thus these terms are given in the analyses; they are not variables. It is the costs of the methods of mitigation that will vary from site to site. Costs are thus a basis for judging "advantage", "disadvantage" or "neutral".
Legal/Jurisdictional	
(1) Degree of difficulty in obtaining approvals having regard for local by-laws, provincial and federal laws and policies	Replaced by the Legal/Jurisdictional criterion of "Degree of difficulty in obtaining land use approvals having regard for local by-laws, provincial and federal laws and policies". The original intent of this criterion was to focus on land use approvals. This is consistent with the approach taken in Step 1 and Step 2 and their focus on land use designations and zoning as a guide to screening for appropriate buffers.

Addendum to Document 3.5B
Site Selection Process
Composting

Extension of Process to Identify Candidate Sites (Step 2) and the Development of Comparative Evaluation Process For Step 3 of the Site Selection Process for a Compost Facility

Prepared By:

Proctor & Redfern Limited
45 Green Belt Drive
Don Mills, Ontario
M3C 3K3

JANUARY 16, 1991

E.O. 90P21

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
A1.0	PURPOSE OF ADDENDUM	A1
A2.0	AMENDMENT OF STEP 2 CRITERIA	A1
A3.0	APPLICATION OF STEP 2 CRITERIA	A2
A4.0	AMENDMENT OF STEP 3 CRITERIA	A2
A5.0	APPLICATION OF STEP 3 CRITERIA	A3

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2A	Criteria for the Identification of Candidate Sites in Candidate Areas (i.e., Step 2)
Revised Table 2A	Criteria for the Identification of Candidate Sites in Candidate Areas (i.e., Step 2)
Table 2B	Criteria for The Identification of Candidate Sites From List of Willing Host Sites (i.e., Step 2)
Revised Table 2B	Criteria for the Identification of Candidate Sites From List of Willing Host Sites (i.e., Step 2)
Table 2C	Minimum Distances from Boundaries of Natural Environment Features
Table 3	Criteria for the Assessment of the Long List of Candidate Sites to Identify A Short List of Candidate Sites (i.e., Step 3)
Revised Table 3	Criteria for the Assessment of the Long List of Candidate Sites to Identify A Short List of Candidate Sites (i.e., Step 3)
Table 3A.1	Manner of Application of Step 3 Human Health and Safety Criteria to Identify Short List of Compost Facility Candidate Sites
Table 3A.2	Manner of Application of Step 3 Natural Environment Criteria to Identify Short List of Compost Facility Candidate Sites
Table 3A.3	Manner of Application of Step 3 Social/Cultural Criteria to Identify Short List of Compost Facility Candidate Sites
Table 3A.4	Manner of Application of Step 3 Economic/Financial Criteria to Identify Short List of Compost Facility Candidate Sites
Table 3A.5	Manner of Application of Step 3 Technical Criteria to Identify Short List of Compost Facility Candidate Sites

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES (CONT'D)

Table 3A.6	Manner of Application of Step 3 Legal/Jurisdictional Criteria to Identify Short List of Compost Facility Candidate Sites

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure A1	New Step 3 Criteria Which Are Added in Revised Table 3
Figure A2	Step 3 Criteria in Table 3, Discussion Paper 3.5B Which Are Deleted in Revised Table 3

A1.0 PURPOSE OF ADDENDUM

This Addendum to Discussion Paper 3.5B[1] describes the additional criteria identified for use in Step 2 of the site selection process, the revised criteria to be used in Step 3 of the site selection process and the method that will be used to apply the revised Step 3 criteria. This Addendum should be read in conjunction with Discussion Paper 3.5B.

A2.0 AMENDMENT OF STEP 2 CRITERIA

The facility design assumptions for compost facilities (Section 3.2.1, 3.2.2 Discussion Paper 3.5B) were intended to result in a facility with minimal impact on the natural environment. The criteria described on Table 2A and Table 2B in Discussion Paper 3.5B were based on this assumption. On reconsideration, it was decided that reliance on best available proven technology would not necessarily minimize adverse effects on all aspects of the natural environment. Therefore, additional Natural Environment criteria were identified to be used in Step 2. These criteria are included on Revised Table 2A and Revised Table 2B, included in this Addendum.

It was also decided that possible adverse effects arising from traffic entering and leaving the facility could be addressed by avoiding selecting sites that would require the use of streets having sensitive land uses (i.e., residential streets). Therefore, a new Step 2 criterion under Human Health and Safety was added to Revised Table 2A and Revised Table 2B, included in this Addendum. This criterion requires that Candidate Sites be located on streets which are designed for use by the heaviest amount of traffic (i.e., arterial roads). Within Metro, the new criterion focuses on Metro roads, because these roads are arterial in nature and may be more easily improved (e.g., widened, traffic signals, etc.) maintained or repaired by Metro since they are under the control of the Metropolitan Corporation. Outside Metro, the new criterion focuses on Regional, District or County Roads, King's Highways and connecting link highways because these roads are similarly designed for the heaviest

---

1. Discussion Paper 3.5B, Site Selection Process, Composting Sept. 1990

amount of traffic. The criterion also recognizes that, for a Candidate Site co-sited with a Metro landfill site, rail lines may be used to provide access to the compost facility site.

The Social/Cultural criterion described on Table 2A and Table 2B of Discussion Paper 3.5B dealing with heritage and related features has been re-worked. The criterion included on Revised Table 2A and Revised Table 2B addresses the specific interests protected by the federal, provincial and municipal levels of government.

The Land Use criterion described on Table 2A and Table 2B has been expanded to encompass federal Indian reserves. This change is included on Revised Table 2A and Revised Table 2B.

A3.0 APPLICATION OF STEP 2 CRITERIA

All the criteria in Revised Table 2A and Revised Table 2B will be applied in Step 2 to all sites that satisfied the Step 1 criteria for the identification of Candidate Areas and the minimum site size guideline. The sites that satisfy the Step 2 criteria will constitute the long list of Candidate Sites for a compost facility.

Some of the criteria on Revised Table 2A and Revised Table 2B involve the application of minimum distances from described features. These minimum distances are identified in Table 2C to this Addendum.

A4.0 AMENDMENT OF STEP 3 CRITERIA

The Step 3 criteria shown in Revised Table 3 include criteria not included in Table 3, Discussion Paper 3.5B. The reason for each addition is identified in Figure A1. The Revised Table 3 does not include certain criteria from Table 3, Discussion Paper 3.5B. The reason for each deletion is identified in Figure A2.

TABLE 2A
CRITERIA FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF CANDIDATE SITES
IN CANDIDATE AREAS (I.E., STEP 2)

Criteria Category	Human Health and Safety	Natural Environment	Social/Cultural	Land Use	Economic/Financial	Technical	Legal/Jurisdictional
Criteria	o No Step2 Identification criteria	o Site must not fall into any Area of Natural and Scientific Interest (ANSI's)	o Site must not include major features of known historical, heritage, cultural, architectural, or archaeological value	o Site must not be in a designated conservation area, a federal, provincial or municipal park; or a designated floodplain (i.e. by Regulation Fill Line)	o No Step 2 Criteria	o Site must be of sufficient size to provide for compost facility operating requirements, including adequate buffer and screening area	o No Step 2 Criteria
Source of Information	o Secondary source information, zoning and official plan documents, aerial photographs, land assessments records, agency contacts, field investigations, interviews, published information					o Plans showing property boundaries and sketches of preliminary composting plant layout	
Note	* The minimum distances boundaries of natural environment features are shown on Table 2C.						

Original Table 2A From Discussion Paper 3.5B

REVISED TABLE 2A

CRITERIA FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF CANDIDATE SITES IN CANDIDATE AREAS (I.E., STEP 2)

Criteria Category	Human Health and Safety	Natural Environment	Social/Cultural	Land Use	Economic/Financial	Technical	Legal/Jurisdictional
Criteria	Site must be located abutting: o a Metro Road as defined by Metro by-law o a Regional, District or County Road as designated on an Ontario Transportation Map, Series 1-7 o a King's Highway as designated on an Ontario Transportation Map, Series 1-7 o a connecting link highway as designated by MTO(1), or o a road connected to one of the aforementioned roads that is part of an industrial road system identified in an official plan or Site must be adjacent to a railway line and co-sited with a Metro landfill facility (proposed or existing)	Site must not be in: o a federally designated natural area as defined by Canadian Parks Service o a provincially designated natural area as defined by MNR (2) o a municipally designated natural area as defined in an official plan o a life science ANSI(3) as defined by MNR o an earth science ANSI as defined by MNR o a surface water body capable of being a cold or warm water fishery, identifiable on a National Topographic Series Map (Scale 1:50,000) o a natural resource area (gas, oil pool formations, mineral aggregate resources) as defined by MNR o a provincially (Class 1 and 2) or regionally (Class 3) significant wetland as defined by MNR, or o an area with endangered species as identified by MNR or Environment Canada and Site must be a minimum distance* from each of the above	Site must not include: o a feature of heritage value as designated in an official plan o a feature of historical or architectural value designated or listed by a municipality o a feature of historical value designated by Canadian Parks Service o a feature of archaeological value designated or listed by MCC(4), or o a feature owned or controlled by the Ontario Heritage Foundation	Site must not be in: o an Indian reserve as defined by DIAND(5) o a federal park as defined by Canadian Parks Service o a provincial park as defined by MNR o a municipal park as designated in an official plan o a conservation area as defined by a provincially designated conservation authority, or o a floodplain as defined by a Regulation Fill Line	o No Step 2 Criteria	o Site must be of sufficient size to provide for compost facility operating requirements, including adequate buffer and screening area	o No Step 2 Criteria
Source of Information	o Secondary source information, zoning and official plan documents, aerial photographs, land assessments records, agency contacts, field investigations, interviews, published information					o Plans showing property boundaries and sketches of preliminary composting plant layout	
Note	* Minimum distances from boundaries of natural environment features are shown on Table 2C. (1) Ontario Ministry of Transportation (2) Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources (3) Area of Natural and Scientific Interest (4) Ontario Ministry of Culture and Communication (5) Federal Department of Indian and Northern Affairs						

TABLE 2B
CRITERIA FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF CANDIDATE SITES
FROM LIST OF WILLING HOST SITES (I.E., STEP 2)

Criteria Category	Human Health and Safety	Natural Environment	Social/Cultural	Land Use	Economic/Financial	Technical	Legal/Jurisdictional
Criteria	o No Step 2 identification criteria	o Site must not fall into Area of Natural and Scientific Interest (ANSI's)	o Site must not include major features of known historical, heritage, cultural, architectural, or archaeological value	o Site must not be in a designated conservation area; a federal, provincial or municipal park; or a designated floodplain (i.e., by Regulation Fill Line), and o Site must be on: o Land which is zoned industrial or designated in an Official Plan as industrial, or o Land which is zoned agricultural or designated in an Official Plan as agricultural where such land is in the urban shadow, or o Land currently or formerly used for waste management purposes, or o Land where a municipal proponent of an offered site for a landfill facility requires that a compost facility be provided on, or adjacent to the offered site, or o Any combination of the above	o No Step 2 identification criteria	o Site must be of sufficient size to provide for composting facility operating requirements, including adequate buffer and screening area.	o No Step 2 identification criteria
Source of Information	o zoning and Official Plan documents, agency contacts and field investigations, if appropriate Original Table 2B From Discussion Paper 3.5B					o Plans showing property boundaries and sketches of preliminary composting plant layout	

v4:d:\westemgt\eo90p21\comorg2b.xls

[redacted] [redacted] [redacted] [

Table 2C
Minimum Distances From Boundaries
of Natural Environment Features

Natural Environment Feature	Minimum Distance From Boundary of Natural Environment Feature to Property Boundary of Site
Provincially or federally designated natural area	190 m
Municipally designated natural area	190 m
Life science ANSI	190 m
Earth science ANSI	20 m
Surface water body capable of being a cold or warm water fishery	190 m
Natural resource area	20 m
Provincially (Class 1 & 2) and regionally (Class 3) significant wetlands	190 m
Areas with endangered species	190 m or distance required by provincial guideline, if greater than 190 m

The minimum distances in this table are based on the facility design assumptions for a compost facility, which include a minimum distance of 10 m from the compost facility site boundary to the compost facility. Thus, a distance of 190 m in this table results in a minimum distance of 200 m between the compost facility and the boundary of the applicable Natural Environment feature.

TABLE 3
CRITERIA FOR THE ASSESSMENT
OF THE LONG LIST OF CANDIDATE SITES TO
IDENTIFY A SHORT LIST OF CANDIDATE SITES (I.E., STEP 3)

Criteria Category	Human Health and Safety	Natural Environment	Social/Cultural	Economic/Financial	Technical	Legal/Jurisdictional
Criteria	o Effect of traffic changes in injury and non-injury traffic accident rates o Effect of noise, odour and dust o Effect of leachate from composting operations upon surface and groundwater	o Number, extent and significance of woodlots that would be cleared o Proximity to ANSI's o Proximity to designated flood plain areas (i.e., by Regulation Fill Line) o Proximity to environmentally sensitive areas as identified in municipal Official Plans o Proximity to natural resource areas (e.g. gas/oil pool formations, mineral aggregate resources)	o Number of businesses and residences that would be disrupted by a composting facility on a Candidate Site o Number of businesses and residences that would be displaced by a Candidate composting Site o Impact of compost facility related traffic upon areas adjacent to traffic routes o Proximity to major features of known historical, heritage, cultural, archaeological or architectural value o Proximity to potentially affected farming activities o Proximity to major recreational activities o Distance from adjacent sensitive land uses as defined by MOE	o Site acquisition cost o Distance of a Candidate composting facility Site from the location of solid waste generation o Proximity of Provincial highways, Metro arterial roads, County or Regional roads to a Candidate Site o Length and cost of access road requiring construction/improvement to serve a composting facility located on a Candidate Site o Accessibility of the site to the public wishing to acquire and load finished compost product into private vehicles	o Presence of underground and overhead facilities on a Candidate Site that may require displacement or elimination o Distance of a Candidate composting facility Site to sanitary sewers, water supply, gas supply, electrical supply and stormwater disposal facilities and adequacy of those facilities in relation to demands on a composting facility o Feasibility, means and cost of mitigation required to reduce or eliminate all constraints identified	o Degree of difficulty in obtaining approvals having regard for local by-laws, provincial and federal laws and policies
Source of information	o secondary source information, zoning and Official Plan documents, aerial photographs, land assessment records, agency contacts, field investigations, interviews, and published information					

Original Table 3 From Discussion Paper 3.5B

v4:d:\wastemgt\eo90p21\comorgt3.xls

REVISED TABLE 3
CRITERIA FOR THE ASSESSMENT
OF THE LONG LIST OF CANDIDATE SITES TO
IDENTIFY A SHORT LIST OF CANDIDATE SITES (I.E., STEP 3)

Criteria Category	Human Health and Safety	Natural Environment	Social/Cultural	Economic/Financial	Technical	Legal/Jurisdictional
Criteria	o Effect of fugitive emissions (noise, odour, dust)	o Prombity to federally designated natural areas as defined by Canadian Parks Service o Proximity to provincially designated natural areas as defined by MNR o Proximity to municipally designated natural areas as defined in an official plan o Proximity to a life science ANSIs as defined by MNR o Proximity to surface water bodies capable of being cold or warm water fisheries, identifiable on a National Topographic Series Map (scale 1:50,000) o Proximity to provincially (Class 1 and 2) or regionally (Class 3) significant wetlands as defined by MNR o Proximity to areas with endangered species as identified by MNR or Environment Canada o Number, extent and significance of woodlots that would be cleared	o Number of businesses and residences that would be displaced by a Candidate compost facility Site o Proximity to features of heritage value as defined in an official plan o Proximity to features of historical or architectural value designated or listed by a municipality o Proximity to features of historical value as designated by Canadian Parks Service o Proximity to features of archaeological value designated or listed by MCC o Proximity to features owned or controlled by the Ontario Heritage Foundation o Proximity to Indian reserves as defined by DIAND o Proximity to federal parks as defined by Canadian Parks Service o Proximity to provincial parks as defined by MNR o Proximity to municipal parks as designated in an official plan o Proximity to conservation areas as defined by a provincially designated conservation authority o Proximity to potentially affected farming activities o Proximity to sensitive land uses	o Site acquisition cost o Cost of mitigation required to reduce or eliminate all constraints identified	o Presence of underground and overhead facilities on a Candidate Site that may require displacement or elimination o Distance of a Candidate Site to sanitary sewers, water supply, gas supply, electrical supply and storm-water disposal facilities and adequacy of those facilities in relation to demands of a compost facility	o Degree of difficulty in obtaining land use approvals having regard for local by-laws, provincial and federal laws and policies o Ease of site access for investigation purposes
Source of Information	o secondary source information, zoning and Official Plan documents, aerial photographs, land assessment records, agency contacts, field investigations, interviews, and published information					

v4:\d:\wastemgt\ec90p21\comrevt3.xls

TABLE 3A.1
MANNER OF APPLICATION
OF STEP 3 HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY CRITERIA
TO IDENTIFY SHORT LIST OF COMPOST FACILITY CANDIDATE SITES

Human Health and Safety	Advantage	Neutral	Disadvantage	Rationale
(1) Effect of fugitive emissions (noise, odour, dust)	o Nearest residence is more than 490 m from site.	o Nearest residence is between 90 - 490 m from the site.	o Nearest residence is less than 90 m from the site.	o Distances of up to 90 m are judged equivalent to adjacent. In the absence of specific guidelines on minimum distance separation between compost facilities and residences with respect to fugitive emissions, regard has been given to the following related MOE policies and guidelines: MOE (Central Region) document entitled "Buffers; Use and Design Guidelines", December 1981 states "Separation distance(s) of 90 to 300 m between residential buildings and medium industrial use buildings are considered acceptable minimums". MOE policy document No. 07-07, "Guidelines for Land Use on or near Landfills and Dumps" states "The most significant adverse environmental effects to be normally within 500 m of a fill area".
Source of Information	o Secondary source information, zoning and Official Plan documents, aerial photographs, land assessment records, agency contacts, field investigations, interviews and published information			
Note	o Distances shown are measured from the boundaries of the compost facility Candidate Site. There is a 10 m buffer between the compost facility and the boundary of the Candidate Site.			

v4:\d:\wastemgt\eo90p21\comtb1.xls

TABLE 3A.2

MANNER OF APPLICATION

OF STEP 3 NATURAL ENVIRONMENT CRITERIA

TO IDENTIFY SHORT LIST OF COMPOST FACILITY CANDIDATE SITES

Natural Environment	Advantage	Neutral	Disadvantage	Rationale
(1) Proximity to federally designated natural areas as designated by Canadian Parks Service (2) Proximity to provincially designated natural areas as defined by MNR	o Site is more than 990 m from a provincially of federally designated natural area.	o Site is between 490-990 m from a provincially of federally designated natural area.	o Site is 190-490 m from a provincially or federally designated natural area.	o In the absence of specific guidelines on minimum distance separation between MRFs and natural environment features, regard has been given to the following MOE and MNR policies and guidelines: MOE (Central Region) document entitled "Buffers, Use and Design Guidelines", December 1981 states "Separation distance(s) of 90 to 300 m between residential buildings and medium industrial use buildings are considered acceptable minimums". MOE policy document No. 07-07, "Guidelines for Land Use on or near Landfills and Dumps" states "The most significant adverse environmental effects to be normally within 500 m of a fill area". MNR Management Guidelines (Heronries) suggest a minimal impact beyond 1000 m. This is the greatest distance separation required for a species that is not endangered and thus represents a very conservative standard.
(3) Proximity to municipally designated natural areas as designated in an official plan	o Site is more than 990 m from municipally designated natural area	o Site is between 490-990 m from municipally designated natural area	o Site is 190-490 m from municipally designated natural area	o As per (1)
(4) Proximity to life science ANSI's as defined by MNR	o Site is more than 990 m from a life science ANSI	o Site is between 490-990 m from life science ANSI	o Site is 190-490 m from a life science ANSI	o As per (1)
(5) Proximity to suface water bodies capable of being a cold or warm water fishery identifiable on a National Topographic Series Map (scale 1:50,000)	o Site is more than 990 m from edge of surface water	o Site is between 490-990 m from edge of surface water	o Site is 190-490 m from edge of surface water	o As per (1)
(6) Proximity to provincially (Class 1and 2) and regionally (Class 3) significant wetlands as defined by MNR	o Site is more than 990 m from wetland	o Site is between 490-990 m from wetland	o Site is 190-490 m from wetland	o As per (1)

Cont'd.....

TABLE 3/C2

MANNER OF APPLICATION

OF STEP 3 NATURAL ENVIRONMENT CRITERIA

TO IDENTIFY SHORT LIST OF COMPOST FACILITY CANDIDATE SITES

Natural Environment	Advantage	Neutral	Disadvantage	Rationale
(7) Proximity to areas with endangered species as identified by MNR or Environment Canada	o Site is more than 990 m from area of endangered species except where an existing MNR guideline provides for a greater setback. In this circumstance an advantage would be a site outside the MNR guideline setback.	o Site is between 490-990 m from the area of endangered species, except where an existing MNR guideline provides for a greater setback. In this circumstance a site inside the MNR setback is judged excluded under Step 2 criteria.	o Site is 190-490 m from area of endangered species, except when an existing MNR guideline provides for a greater setback. In this circumstance a site inside the MNR setback is judged excluded under Step 2 criteria.	o As per (1)
(8) Number, extent and significance of woodlots to be cleared	o No woodlot to be partially or completely cleared.	o Any woodlot which must be cleared, in whole or in part, is not significant*	o Site requires partial or complete clearance of one or more significant* woodlots	o Significant* woodlots will contain relatively unaffected areas in the interior parts which are relatively unaffected by woodlot edge impacts.
Source of Information	o Secondary source information, zoning and Official Plan documents, aerial photographs, land assessment records, agency contacts, field investigations, interviews and published information			
Notes	o Distances shown are measured from the boundaries of the compost facility Candidate Site. There is a 10 M buffer between the compost facility and the boundary of the Candidate Site. * A significant woodlot is greater than 4 ha. in area and comprises later, more mature stages of plant succession and is over 75 years old.			

v4:d:\wastemgt\eo90p21\comtb2.xls

TABLE 3A.3
MANNER OF APPLICATION
OF STEP 3 SOCIAL/CULTURAL CRITERIA
TO IDENTIFY SHORT LIST OF COMPOST FACILITY CANDIDATE SITES

Social/Cultural	Advantage	Neutral	Disadvantage	Rationale
(1) Number of businesses and residences that would be displaced by a Canadidate compost facility Site	o No business or residence displaced	o One business or residence displaced*	o More than one business or residence displaced*	o Since a compost facility is a business, a compost facility that replaces one business or residence is judged to be neutral. It is assumed at this time that an owner of a site, offered to Metro upon which there are any number of residences or businesses that will be displaced by the compost facility, will have determined that "displacement" is not an issue (as far as the owner is concerned). Hence such a site will be rated as Advantage "no business or residence displaced".
(2) Proximity to features of heritage value as designated by an official plan	o Site is more than 490 m from feature	o Site is between 90 ... and 490 m from feature	o Site is less than 90 m from feature	o Distances of up to 90 m from a feature are judged equivalent to adjacent. In the absence of specific guidelines on minimum distance separation between compost facilities and specific land uses, regard has been given to the following related MOE policies and guidelines: MOE (Central Region) document entitled "Buffers; Use and Design Guidelines", December 1981 states "Separation distance(s) of 90 to 300 m between residential buildings and medium industrial use buildings are considered acceptable minimums". MOE policy document No. 07-07, "Guidelines for Land Use on or near Landfills and Dumps" states "The most significant adverse environmental effects to be normally within 500 m of a fill area".
(3) Proximity to features of historical or architectural value designated or listed by a municipality	o Site is more than 490 m from feature	o Site is between 90 m and 490 m from feature	o Site is less than 90 m from feature	o As per (2)
(4) Proximity to features of historical value as designated by Canadian Parks Service	o Site is more than 490 m from feature	o Site is between 90 m and 490 m from feature	o Site is less than 90 m from feature	o As per (2)

TABLE 3A.3
MANNER OF APPLICATION
OF STEP 3 SOCIAL/CULTURAL CRITERIA
TO IDENTIFY SHORT LIST OF COMPOST FACILITY CANDIDATE SITES

Social/Cultural	Advantage	Neutral	Disadvantage	Rationale
(5) Proximity to features of archaeological value designated or listed by MCC	o Site is more than 490 m from feature	o Site is between 90 m and 490 m from feature	o Site is less than 90 m from feature	o As per (2)
(6) Proximity to features owned or controlled by the Ontario Heritage Foundation	o Site is more than 490 m from feature	o Site is between 90 m and 490 m from feature	o Site is less than 90 m from feature	o As per (2)
(7) Proximity to Indian reserves as defined by DIAND	o Site is more than 490 m from feature	o Site is between 90 m and 490 m from feature	o Site is less than 90 m from feature	o As per (2)
(8) Proximity to federal parks as defined by Canadian Parks Service	o Site is more than 490 m from feature	o Site is between 90 m and 490 m from feature	o Site is less than 90 m from feature	o As per (2)
(9) Proximity to provincial parks ad defined by MNR	o Site is more than 490 m from feature	o Site is between 90 m and 490 m from feature	o Site is less than 90 m from feature	o As per (2)
(10) Proximity to municipal parks as designated on an official plan	o Site is more than 490 m from feature	o Site is between 90 m and 490 m from feature	o Site is less than 90 m from feature	o As per (2)
(11) Proximity to conservation areas as defined by a provincially designated conservation authority	o Site is more than 490 m from feature	o Site is between 90 m and 490 m from feature	o Site is less than 90 m from feature	o As per (2)
(12) Proximity to potentially affected farming activities	o Site is more than 490 m from boundary of nearest farm.	o Site is between 210 m and 490 m of boundary of nearest farm.	o Site is less than 210 m from boundary of nearest farm.	o As per (2). Regard has also been given to the OMAF*** Agricultural Code of Practice, 1976. The average calculation of minimum distance separation for standard livestock operations is approximately 220 m. Therefore, any distance less than 220 m is judged to be a Disadvantage.
(13) Proximity to sensitive land uses	o Site is more than 490 m from nearest sensitive land use. **	o Site is between 90 m and 490 m from nearest sensitive land use. **	o Site is less than 90 m from nearest sensitive land use. **	o As per (2)
Source of Information	o Secondary source information, zoning and Official Plan documents, aerial photographs, land assessment records, agency contacts, field investigations, interviews and published information			
Notes	o Distances shown are measured from the boundaries of the compost facility Candidate Site. There is a 10 M buffer between the compost facility and the boundary of the Candidate Site. * Does not apply to land offered to Metro - see rationale for (1) ** Sensitive land uses are defined as: cemeteries and educational, medical and residential uses. *** Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Food			

v4:d:\wastemgt\ec90p21\comtb3.xls

TABLE 3A.4
MANNER OF APPLICATION
OF STEP 3 ECONOMIC/FINANCIAL CRITERIA
TO IDENTIFY SHORT LIST OF COMPOST FACILITY CANDIDATE SITES

Economic/Financial	Advantage	Neutral	Disadvantage	Rationale
(1) Site acquisition cost	o Below $1,000,000 per hectare.	o $1,000,000-$1,700,000 per hectare.	o Above $1,700,000 per hectare.	o General industrial land costs in Metro range from $1,000,000-$1,700,000 per hectare. Prime sites are more expensive. Land costs below Metro general industrial costs are judged to be Advantage.
(2) Cost of mitigation required to reduce or eliminate all constraints identified	o Costs of mitigation up to $1 million	o Costs of mitigation between $1-2 million	o Costs of mitigation more than $2 million	o Site is more economically attractive when mitigation costs are low. Costs of over 10% of cost of a compost facility is judged to be Disadvantage.
Source of Information	o Secondary source information, zoning and Official Plan documents, aerial photographs, land assessment records, agency contacts, field investigations, interviews and published information			

v4:d:\wastemgt\eo90p21\comtb4.xls

TABLE 3A.5
MANNER OF APPLICATION
OF STEP 3 TECHNICAL CRITERIA
TO IDENTIFY SHORT LIST OF COMPOST FACILITY CANDIDATE SITES

Technical	Advantage	Neutral	Disadvantage	Rationale
(1) Presence of underground and overhead facilities on a Candidate compost facility Site that may require displacement or elimination	o No utility facilities requiring relocation.	o Presence of two minor * utility facilities providing services to others requiring relocation.	o Site has three or more minor * utility facilities providing services to others requiring relocation; or site has one or more major * utility facilities providing services to others requiring relocation.	o Rerouting utility facilities providing services to others is costly and causes disruption to customers. Relocation of some major * utility facilities may not be reasonable or or feasible.
(2) Distance of a Candidate compost facility Site to sanitary sewers, water supply, gas supply, electrical supply and stormwater disposal facilities and adequacy of those facilities in relation to demands of a compost facility	o Adequate services are within 0.5 km of site.	o Adequate services are within 2 km of site.	o Adequate services are more than 2 km from the site.	o Service connection costs are lower when the site is close to existing services o Upgrading of services adds to cost and complexity
Source of Information	o Secondary source information, zoning and Official Plan documents, aerial photographs, land assessment records, agency contacts, field investigations, interviews, and published information.			
Notes	o * Minor utility facilities are sewers up to 750 mm diameter, watermains up to 300 mm diameter, gas mains up to 300 mm diameter, electrical distribution systems up 100 kv, and telecommunication facilities for up to 1000 persons. o * Major utility facilities are oil pipelines and sewers, watermains, gas mains, electric distribution systems and telecommunication systems of larger capacity than minor systems.			

v4:d:\wastemgt\eo90p21\comtb5.xls

TABLE 3A.6
MANNER OF APPLICATION
OF STEP 3 LEGAL/JURISDICTIONAL CRITERIA
TO IDENTIFY SHORT LIST OF COMPOST FACILITY CANDIDATE SITES

Legal/Jurisdictional	Advantage	Neutral	Disadvantage	Rationale
(1) Degree of difficulty in obtaining land use approvals, having regard for local by-laws, provincial and federal laws and policies	o Site is industrially zoned and designated as industrial in the appropriate official plan, and there is no evidence as of December 15, 1990 of a municipal intention to change the permitted land use to a different designation, or site is located on provincial or federal land with no applicable land use constraints.	o Site is either industrially zoned or designated as industrial in the appropriate official plan and there is no evidence as of December 15, 1990 of a municipal intention to change the permitted land use to a different designation.	o Site is either not zoned and not designated as industrial in the appropriate official plan or there is evidence as of December 15, 1990 of a municipal intention to change the land use from the industrial designation to a different designation or site is located on provincial or federal land with an applicable land use constraint.	o Site on land where land use designation is close to the proposed use will experience less difficulty with approvals for land use designation changes.
(2) Ease of site access for site investigation purposes	o Metro owned surplus land or Metro Works controlled land.	o Land offered to Metro.	o Land other than Metro owned surplus land and Metro Works' controlled land or land offered to Metro.	o Access for investigation purposes is easier to acquire for Metro owned land and offered land.
Source of Information	o Secondary source information, zoning and Official Plan documents, aerial photographs, land assessment records, agency contacts, field investigations, interviews, and published information			

v4:\d:\wastemgt\so90p21\comtb6.xls

A5.0 APPLICATION OF STEP 3 CRITERIA

The objective of Step 3 is to produce a short list of Candidate Sites from a long list of Candidate Sites by assessing the relative advantages and disadvantages of establishing a facility at each of the Candidate Sites on the long list. The assessment uses the criteria set out on Revised Table 3.

Each Candidate Site on the long list will be assigned a rating of "advantage", "neutral" or "disadvantage" relative to each criterion shown on Revised Table 3A, applied in the manner described in Tables 3A.1 - 3A.6. The sites with the most "disadvantage" ratings will be eliminated, one at a time, until there is a reasonable number of reasonable sites or until there are no sites with "disadvantage" ratings. In the former case, these sites will constitute the short list of Candidate Sites. In the latter case, where there is more than a reasonable number of reasonable sites, sites with the most "neutral" ratings will be eliminated one at a time, until there is a reasonable number of reasonable sites or until there are no sites with "neutral" ratings. In the former case, these sites will constitute the short list of Candidate Sites. In the latter case, even where there remain more than a reasonable number of reasonable sites, these sites will constitute the short list of Candidate Sites because all remaining sites will have only "advantage" ratings and cannot be further assessed using Step 3 criteria.

FIGURE A1
NEW STEP 3 CRITERIA WHICH ARE ADDED IN REVISED TABLE 3

Criterion		Rationale For Addition
Natural Environment		
(1)	Proximity to a federally designated natural area as defined by Canadian Parks Service	Added to be consistent with the Natural Environment criterion added to Revised Table 2A and Revised Table 2B.
(2)	Proximity to a provincially designated natural area as defined by MNR	See (1) above
(3)	Proximity to municipally designated natural area	See (1) above
(4)	Proximity to surface water body capable of being a warm or cold water fishery	See (1) above. This criterion also replaces the criterion in Table 3 entitled "Proximity to designated flood areas".
(5)	Proximity to a provincially (Class 1 and 2) or regionally (Class 3) significant wetland	See (1) above
(6)	Proximity to areas with endangered species	See (1) above
Social/Cultural		
(1)	Number of businesses and residences that would be disrupted by a MRF on a Candidate Site	This criterion was to be applied by identifying the number of businesses located on the steets within 500 m of the site. It was concluded that traffic effects could be more effectively addressed by the Human Health and Safety criterion identified in Revised Table 2A and Revised Table 2B. A further analysis of business disruption will be carried out in Step 4 of the site seleciton process.
(2)	Proximity to features of heritage value as designated by an official plan	Added to be consistent with the Social/Cultural criterion added to Revised Table 2A and Revised Table 2B.
(3)	Proximity to features of historical or architectural value designated or listed by a municipality	See (2) above

FIGURE A1 (Cont'd)
NEW STEP 3 CRITERIA WHICH ARE ADDED IN REVISED TABLE 3

Criterion		Rationale For Addition
Social/Cultural (Cont'd)		
(4)	Proximity to features of historical value as designated by Canadian Parks Service	See (2) above
(5)	Proximity to features of archaeological value designated or listed by MCC	See (2) above
(6)	Proximity to features owned or controlled by Ontario Heritage Foundation	See (2) above
(7)	Proximity to Indian reserves as defined by DIAND	Added to be consistent with the Land Use criterion added to Revised Table 2A and Revised Table 2B.
(8)	Proximity to federal parks as defined by Canadian Parks Service	See (7) above
(9)	Proximity to provincial parks as defined by MNR	See (7) above
(10)	Proximity to municipal parks as designated on an official plan	See (7) above
(11)	Proximity to conservation areas as defined by a provincially designated conservation authority	See (7) above
Economic/Financial		
(1)	Cost of mitigation required to reduce or eliminate all constraints identified	Removed from Technical, and modified to indicate only "cost", and added to Economic/Financial.
Legal/Jurisdictional		
(1)	Ease of site access for site investigation purposes	Added to recognise that a site search can be severely hampered (i.e. made longer and more expensive) if access for investigation purposes is not obtained in a timely manner.

FIGURE A2
STEP 3 CRITERIA IN TABLE 3, DISCUSSION PAPER 3.5B
WHICH ARE DELETED IN REVISED TABLE 3

Criterion		Rationale For Deletion
Human Health & Safety		
(1)	Effect of traffic changes on injury and non-injury accident rates	Addressed by the Human Health and Safety criterion in Revised Table 2A and Revised Table 2B. See section A2.0 of this Addendum.
(2)	Effect of noise, odour and dust	Replaced by Human Health and Safety criterion in Revised Table 3 entitled "Effect of fugitive emissions (noise, odour and dust)".
(3)	Effect of leachate from composting operations on surface and groundwater	This criterion is partially addressed by the Natural Environment criterion in Revised Table 3 entitled, "Proximity to a surface water body capable of being a cold or warm water fishery, identifiable on a National Topographic Series Map (scale 1:50,000). It will be further addressed in the Step 4 site specific comparative evaluation.
Natural Environment		
(1)	Proximity to earth science areas of natural and scientific interest (ANSI)	There is no expected impact from the compost facility beyond the distance shown in Table 2C.
(2)	Proximity to designated flood plain areas	Replaced by the Natural Environment criterion for surface water capable of being a cold or warm water fishery in Revised Table 2A and Revised Table 2B.
(3)	Proximity to environmentally sensitive areas as identified in municipal official plans	Addressed by the Natural Environment criteria of "Proximity to provincially or federally designated natural areas" and "Proximity to municipally designated natural area" in Revised Table 3.
(4)	Proximity to natural resource areas	There is no expected impact from the compost facility beyond the distance shown in Table 2C.

FIGURE A2 (Cont'd)
STEP 3 CRITERIA IN TABLE 3, DISCUSSION PAPER 3.5B
WHICH ARE DELETED IN REVISED TABLE 3

Criterion		Rationale For Deletion
Social/Cultural		
(1)	Number of businesses and residences that would be disrupted by a compost facility on a Candidate Site	This criterion was to be applied by identifying the number of businesses located on the streets within 500 m of the site. It was concluded that traffic effects could be more effectively addressed by the Human Health and Safety criterion identified in Revised Table 2A and Revised Table 2B. A further analysis of business disruption will be carried out in Step 4 of the site selection process.
(2)	Impact of compost facility related traffic upon areas adjacent to traffic routes	This criterion was to be applied by identifying the number of businesses and residences located on the streets within 500 m of the site. It was concluded that traffic effects could be more effectively addressed by the Human Health and Safety criterion identified in Revised Table 2A and Revised Table 2B.
(3)	Distance from sensitive land uses as defined by MOE.	Replaced by "Proximity to sensitive land uses". Reference to MOE was deleted since MOE has no definition of sensitive land uses.
(4)	Proximity to major recreational activities	In Revised Table 2A and Revised Table 2B, Land Use, sites within designated Indian reserves, conservation areas or federal, provincial or municipal parks were eliminated. To ensure clarity and consistency in the criterion, this Table 3 criterion has been reworked in Revised Table 3 to include areas adjacent to Indian reserves, conservation areas and federal, provincial and municipal parks.
Economic/Financial		
(1)	Distance of Candidate compost facility Site from the location of solid waste generation	This criterion will be addressed in Step 4 of the site selection process.

FIGURE A2 (Cont'd)
STEP 3 CRITERIA IN TABLE 3, DISCUSSION PAPER 3.5B
WHICH ARE DELETED IN REVISED TABLE 3

Criterion		Rationale For Deletion
Economic/Financial (Cont'd)		
(2)	Proximity of Provincial highways, Metro arterial roads, county or regional roads to a Candidate compost facility Site	See rationale for (1) above.
(3)	Length and cost of access road requiring construction/improvement to serve compost facility located on Candidate Site	Within Metro access road requirements are expected to be minimal based on Revised Table 2A and Revised Table 2B, Human Health and Safety criterion. This is a comparative criterion and will be addressed in Step 4.
(4)	Accessibility of the site to the public wishing to load finished compost product into private vehicles.	See rationale for (1) above.
Technical		
(1)	Feasibility, means and cost of mitigation required to reduce or eliminate all constraints identified	Replaced by Economic/Financial criterion. "Cost of mitigation required to reduce or eliminate all constraints identified". "feasibility" and "means" were deleted since the Environmental Assessment Act requires that means of mitigation be considered in assessing the advantages and disadvantages of potential sites. Thus these terms are given in the analyses; they are not variables. It is the costs of the methods of mitigation that will vary from site to site. Costs are thus a basis for judging "advantage", "disadvantage" or "neutral".

FIGURE A2 (Cont'd)
STEP 3 CRITERIA IN TABLE 3, DISCUSSION PAPER 3.5B
WHICH ARE DELETED IN REVISED TABLE 3

Criterion	Rationale For Deletion
Legal/Jurisdictional	
(1) Degree of difficulty in obtaining approvals having regard for local by-laws, provincial and federal laws and policies	Replaced by the Legal/Jurisdictional criterion of "Degree of difficulty in obtaining land use approval having regard for local by-laws, provincial and federal laws and policies." The original intent of this criterion was to focus on land use approvals. This is consistent with the approach taken in Step 1 and Step 2 and their focus on land use designations and zoning as a guide to screening for appropriate buffers.

Addendum to Document 3.5C
Site Selection Process
Energy From Waste (EFW)

Extension of Process to Identify Candidate Sites (Step 2) and the Development of Comparative Evaluation Process For Step 3 of the Site Selection Process for an EFW Facility

Prepared By:

Proctor & Redfern Limited
45 Green Belt Drive
Don Mills, Ontario
M3C 3K3

JANUARY 16, 1991 **E.O. 90P21**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
A1.0	PURPOSE OF ADDENDUM	A1
A2.0	AMENDMENT OF STEP 2 CRITERIA	A1
A3.0	APPLICATION OF STEP 2 CRITERIA	A2
A4.0	AMENDMENT OF STEP 3 CRITERIA	A2
A5.0	APPLICATION OF STEP 3 CRITERIA	A3

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2A	Criteria for the Identification of Candidate Sites in Candidate Areas (i.e., Step 2)
Revised Table 2A	Criteria for the Identification of Candidate Sites in Candidate Areas (i.e., Step 2)
Table 2B	Criteria for The Identification of Candidate Sites From List of Willing Host Sites (i.e., Step 2)
Revised Table 2B	Criteria for the Identification of Candidate Sites From List of Willing Host Sites (i.e., Step 2)
Table 2C	Minimum Distances from Boundaries of Natural Environment Features
Table 3	Criteria for the Assessment of the Long List of Candidate Sites to Identify a Short List of Candidate Sites (i.e., Step 3)
Revised Table 3	Criteria for the Assessment of the Long List of Candidate Sites to Identify a Short List of Candidate Sites (i.e., Step 3)
Table 3A.1	Manner of Application of Step 3 Human Health and Safety Criteria to Identify Short List of EFW Facility Candidate Sites
Table 3A.2	Manner of Application of Step 3 Natural Environment Criteria to Identify Short List of EFW Facility Candidate Sites
Table 3A.3	Manner of Application of Step 3 Social/Cultural Criteria to Identify the Short List of EFW Facility Candidate Sites
Table 3A.4	Manner of Application of Step 3 Economic/Financial Criteria to Identify Short List of EFW Facility Candidate Sites
Table 3A.5	Manner of Application of Step 3 Technical Criteria to Identify Short List of EFW Facility Candidate Sites

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES (CONT'D)

Table 3A.6	Manner of Application of Step 3 Legal/Jurisdictional Criteria to Identify Short List of EFW Facility Candidate Sites

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure A1	New Step 3 Criteria Which Are Added in Revised Table 3
Figure A2	Step 3 Criteria in Table 3, Discussion Paper 3.5C Which Are Deleted in Revised Table 3

A1.0 PURPOSE OF ADDENDUM

This Addendum to Discussion Paper 3.5C[1] describes the additional criteria identified for use in Step 2 of the site selection process, the revised criteria to be used in Step 3 of the site selection process and the method that will be used to apply the revised Step 3 criteria. This Addendum should be read in conjunction with Discussion Paper 3.5C.

A2.0 AMENDMENT OF STEP 2 CRITERIA

The facility design assumptions for EFW facilities (Section 3.2.1, 3.2.2 Discussion Paper 3.5C) were intended to result in a facility with minimal impact on the natural environment. The criteria described on Table 2A and Table 2B in Discussion Paper 3.5C were based on this assumption. On reconsideration, it was decided that reliance on best available proven technology would not necessarily minimize adverse effects on all aspects of the natural environment. Therefore, additional Natural Environment criteria were identified to be used in Step 2. These criteria are included on Revised Table 2A and Revised Table 2B, included in this Addendum.

It was also decided that possible adverse effects arising from traffic entering and leaving the facility could be addressed by avoiding selecting sites that would require the use of streets having sensitive land uses (i.e. residential streets). Therefore, a new Step 2 criterion under Human Health and Safety was added to Revised Table 2A and Revised Table 2B, included in this Addendum. This criterion requires that Candidate Sites be located on streets which are designed for use by the heaviest amount of traffic (i.e. arterial roads). Within Metro, the new criterion focuses on Metro roads, because these roads are arterial in nature and may be more easily improved (e.g., widened, traffic signals, etc.) maintained or repaired by Metro since they are under the control of the Metropolitan Corporation. Outside Metro, the new criterion focuses on Regional, District or County Roads, King's Highways and connecting link highways because these roads are similarly designed for the heaviest

---

1. Discussion Paper 3.5C, Site Selection Process, Energy From Waste (EFW) Sept. 1990

amount of traffic. The criterion also recognizes that, for a Candidate Site co-sited with a Metro landfill site, rail lines may be used to provide access to the EFW facility site.

The Social/Cultural criterion described on Table 2A and Table 2B of Discussion Paper 3.5C dealing with heritage and related features has been re-worked. The criterion included on Revised Table 2A and Revised 2B addresses the specific interests protected by the federal, provincial and municipal levels of government.

The Land Use criterion described on Table 2A and Table 2B has been expanded to encompass federal Indian reserves. This change is included on Revised Table 2A and Revised Table 2B.

A3.0 APPLICATION OF STEP 2 CRITERIA

All the criteria in Revised Table 2A and Revised Table 2B will be applied in Step 2 to all sites that satisfied the Step 1 criteria for the identification of Candidate Areas and the minimum site size guideline. The sites that satisfy the Step 2 criteria will constitute the long list of Candidate Sites for an EFW facility.

Some of the criteria on Revised Table 2A and Revised Table 2B involve the application of minimum distances from described features. These minimum distances are identified in Table 2C to this Addendum.

A4.0 AMENDMENT OF STEP 3 CRITERIA

The Step 3 criteria shown in Revised Table 3 include criteria not included in Table 3, Discussion Paper 3.5C. The reason for each addition is identified in Figure A1. The Revised Table 3 does not include certain criteria from Table 3, Discussion Paper 3.5C. The reason for each deletion is identified in Figure A2.

TABLE 2A
CRITERIA FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF CANDIDATE SITES
IN CANDIDATE AREAS (I.E., STEP 2)

Criteria Category	Human Health and Safety	Natural Environment	Social/Cultural	Land Use	Economic/Financial	Technical	Legal/Jurisdictional
Criteria	o Site must not be in conflict with Transport Canada regulations respecting the height of stack relative to air transport operations	o Site must not fall into any Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest (ANSI's)	o Site must not include major features of known historical, heritage, cultural, architectural, or archaeological value	o Site must not be in a designated conservation area; a federal, provincial or municipal park; or a designated floodplain (i.e., by Regulation Fill Line)	o No Step 2 identification criteria	o Site must be of sufficient size to provide for EFW facility operating requirements, including adequate buffer and screening area	o No Step 2 identification criteria
Source of Information	o secondary source information, zoning and official plan documents, aerial photographs, land assessments records, agency contacts, field investigations, interviews, published information Original Table 2A From Discussion Paper 3.5C					o Plans showing property boundaries and sketches of preliminary EFW plant layout	

REVISED TABLE 2A

CRITERIA FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF CANDIDATE SITES IN CANDIDATE AREAS (I.E., STEP 2)

Criteria Category	Human Health and Safety	Natural Environment	Social/Cultural	Land Use	Economic/Financial	Technical	Legal/Jurisdictional
Criteria	Site must be located abutting: o a Metro Road as defined by Metro by-law o a Regional, District or County Road as designated on an Ontario Transportation Map, Series 1-7 o a King's Highway as designated on an Ontario Transportation Map, Series 1-7 o a connecting link highway as designated by MTO(1), or o a road connected to one of the aforementioned roads that is part of an industrial road system identified in an official plan or Site must be adjacent to a railway line and co-sited with a Metro landfill facility (proposed or existing) o Site must not be in conflict with Transport Canada regulations respecting the height of stack relative to air transport operations	Site must not be in: o a federally designated natural area as defined by Canadian Parks Service o a provincially designated natural area as defined by MNR (2) o a municipally designated natural area as defined in an official plan o a life science ANSI(3) as defined by MNR o an earth science ANSI as defined by MNR o a surface water body capable of being a cold or warm water fishery, identifiable on a National Topographic Series Map (Scale 1:50,000) o a natural resource area (gas, oil pool formations, mineral aggregate resources) as defined by MNR o a provincially (Class 1 and 2) or regionally (Class 3) significant wetland as defined by MNR, or o an area with endangered species as identified by MNR or Environment Canada and Site must be a minimum distance* from each of the above	Site must not include: o a feature of heritage value as designated in an official plan o a feature of historical or architectural value designated or listed by a municipality o a feature of historical value designated by Canadian Parks Service o a feature of archaeological value designated or listed by MCC(4), or o a feature owned or controlled by the Ontario Heritage Foundation	Site must not be in: o an Indian reserve as defined by DIAND(5) o a federal park as defined by Canadian Parks Service o a provincial park as defined by MNR o a municipal park as designated in an official plan o a conservation area as defined by a provincially designated conservation authority, or o a floodplain as defined by a Regulation Fill Line	o No Step 2 Criteria	o Site must be of sufficient size to provide for EFW facility operating requirements, including adequate buffer and screening area	o No Step 2 Criteria
Source of Information	o Secondary source information, zoning and official plan documents, aerial photographs, land assessments records, agency contacts, field investigations, interviews, published information					o Plans showing property boundaries and sketches of preliminary EFW plant layout	
Note	* Minimum distances from boundaries of natural environment features are shown on Table 2C. (1) Ontario Ministry of Transportation (2) Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources (3) Area of Natural and Scientific Interest (4) Ontario Ministry of Culture and Communication (5) Federal Department of Indian and Northern Affairs						

v4:d:wastemgt:eo90p21:efwrev2a.xls

TABLE 2B

CRITERIA FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF CANDIDATE SITES
FROM LIST OF WILLING HOST SITES (I.E., STEP 2)

Criteria Category	Human Health and Safety	Natural Environment	Social/Cultural	Land Use	Economic/Financial	Technical	Legal/Jurisdictional
Criteria	o Site must not be in conflict with Transport Canada regulations respecting the height of stack relative to air transport operations	o Site must not fall into any Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest (ANSI's)	o Site must not include major features of known historical, heritage, cultural, architectural, or archaeological value	o Site must not be in a designated conservation area; a federal, provincial or municipal park; or a designated floodplain (i.e., by Regulation Fill Line), and o Site must be on: o Land which is zoned industrial or designated in an Official Plan as industrial, or o Land which is zoned agricultural or designated in an Official Plan as agricultural where such land is in the urban shadow, or o Land currently or formerly used for waste management purposes, or o Land where a municipal proponent of an offered site for a landfill facility requires that an EFW facility be provided on, or adjacent to the offered site, or o Any combination of the above	o No Step 2 identification criteria	o Site must be of sufficient size to provide for EFW facility operating requirements, including adequate buffer and screening area.	o No Step 2 identification criteria
Source of information	o zoning and Official Plan documents, agency contacts and field investigations, if appropriate Original Table 2B From Discussion Paper 3.5C					o Plans showing property boundaries and sketches of preliminary EFW layout	

REVISED TABLE 2B

CRITERIA FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF CANDIDATE SITES
FROM LIST OF WILLING HOST SITES (I.E., STEP 2)

Criteria Category	Human Health and Safety	Natural Environment	Social/Cultural	Land Use	Economic/Financial	Technical	Legal/Jurisdictional
Criteria	Site must be located abutting: o a Metro Road as defined by Metro by-law, o a Regional District or County Road as designated on an Ontario Transporation Map, Series 1-7, o a King's Highway as designated as an Ontario Transporation Map, Series 1-7, o a connecting link highway as designated by MTO(1), or o a road connected to one of the aforementioned roads that is part of an industrial road systems identified in an official plan; or Site must be adjacent to a railway line and co-sited with a Metro landfill facility (proposed or existing) and	Site must not be in: o a federally designated natural area as defined by Canadian Parks Service, o a provincially designated natural area as defined by MNR(2), o a municipally designated natural area as defined in an official plan, o a life science ANSI(3) as defined by MNR, o an earth science ANSI as defined by MNR, o a surface water body capable of being a cold or warm water fishery, identifiable on a National Topographic Series Map (scale 1:50,000), o a national resource area (gas oil pool formation, mineral aggregate resources) as defined by MNR, o a provincially (Class 1 and 2) or regionally (Class 3) significant wetland as defined by MNR, or o an area with endangered species as identified by MNR or Environment Canada and Site must be a minimum distance* from each of the above	Site must not include: o a feature of heritage value as designated in an official plan, o a feature of historical or architectural value designated or listed by a municipality, o a feature of historical value designated by Canadian Parks Service, o a feature of archaeological value designated or listed by MCC(4), or o a feature owned or controlled by the Ontario Heritage Foundation	Site must not be in: o an Indian reserve as defined by DIAND(5), o a federal park as defined by Canadian Parks Service, o a provincial park as defined by MNR, o a municipal park as designated in an official park, o a conservation area as defined by a provincially designated conservation authority, or o a floodplain as defined by Regulation Fill Line and Site must be on: o land which is zoned industrial or designated in an official plan as industrial, or o land which is zoned agricultural or designated in an official plan as agricultural where such land is in the urban shadow, or o land currently or formerly used for waste management purposes, or o land where a municipal proponent of an offered site for a landfill facility requires that an EFW facility be provided on, or adjacent	o No Step 2 Criteria	o Site must be of sufficient size to provide for EFW facility operating requirements, including adequate buffer and screening area.	No Step 2 Criteria

REVISED TABLE 2B

CRITERIA FOR THE IDENTIFICATION OF CANDIDATE SITES
FROM LIST OF WILLING HOST SITES (I.E., STEP 2)

Criteria Category	Human Health and Safety	Natural Environment	Social/Cultural	Land Use	Economic/Financial	Technical	Legal/Jurisdictional
	o Site must not be in conflict with Transport Canada regulations respecting the height of stack relative to air transport operations			o any combination of the above			
Source of information	o Secondary source information, zoning and official plan documents, aerial photographs, land assessments records, agency contacts, field investigations, interviews, published information.					o Plans showing property boundaries and sketches of preliminary EFW plant layout	
Note	* Minimum distances from boundaries of natural environment features are shown on Table 2C. (1) Ontario Ministry of Transportation (2) Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources (3) Area of Natural and Scientific Interest (4) Ontario Ministry of Culture and Communications (5) Federal Department of Indian and Northern Affairs						

v4:d:\wastemgt\ec90p21\efwrev2b.xls

Table 2C
Minimum Distances From Boundaries of Natural Environment Features

Natural Environment Feature	Minimum Distance From Boundary of Natural Environment Feature to Property Boundary of Site
Provincially or federally designated natural area	170 m
Municipally designated natural area	170 m
Life science ANSI	170 m
Earth science ANSI	20 m
Surface water body capable of being a cold or warm water fishery	170 m
Natural resource area	20 m
Provincially (Class 1 & 2) and regionally (Class 3) significant wetlands	170 m
Areas with endangered species	170 m or distance required by provincial guideline, if greater than 170 m

The minimum distances in this table are based on the facility design assumptions for an EFW facility, which include a minimum distance of 30 m from the EFW facility site boundary to the EFW facility building. Thus, a distance of 170 m in this table results in a minimum distance of 200 m between the EFW facility building and the boundary of the applicable Natural Environment feature.

TABLE 3
CRITERIA FOR THE ASSESSMENT
OF THE LONG LIST OF CANDIDATE SITES TO
IDENTIFY A SHORT LIST OF CANDIDATE SITES (I.E., STEP 3)

Criteria Category	Human Health and Safety	Natural Environment	Social/Cultural	Economic/Financial	Technical	Legal/Jurisdictional
Criteria	o Distance from designated flight paths of licensed airports as defined by the Federal Department of Transport o Effect of traffic changes in injury and non-injury traffic accident rates o Effect of noise, odour and dust	o Number, extent and significance of woodlots that would be cleared o Proximity to ANSI's o Proximity to designated flood plain areas (i.e., by Regulation Fill Line) o Proximity to environmentally sensitive areas as identified in municipal Official Plans o Proximity to natural resource areas (e.g. gas/oil pool formations, mineral aggregate resources)	o Number of businesses and residences that would be disrupted by an EFW facility on a Candidate Site o Number of businesses and residences that would be displaced by a Candidate EFW Site o Impact of EFW facility related traffic upon areas adjacent to traffic routes o Proximity to major features of known historical, heritage, cultural, archaeological or architectural value o Proximity to potentially affected farming activities o Proximity to major recreational activities o Distance from adjacent sensitive land uses as defined by MOE	o Site acquisition cost o Distance of a Candidate EFW Site from the location of solid waste generation o Proximity of Provincial highways, Metro arterial roads, County or Regional roads to a Candidate EFW Site o Length and cost of access road requiring construction/improvement to serve an EFW facility located on a Candidate Site o Proximity of energy customer or feasible point of input to electical power grid relative to a Candidate EFW Site	o Presence of underground and overhead facilities on a Candidate EFW Site that may require displacement or elimination o Distance of a Candidate EFW Site to sanitary sewers, water supply, gas supply, electrical supply and stormwater disposal facilities and adequacy of those facilities in relation to demands on an EFW facility o Feasibility, means and cost of mitigation required to reduce or eliminate all constraints identified	o Degree of difficulty in obtaining approvals having regard for local by-laws, provincial and federal laws and policies
Source of Information	o secondary source information, zoning and Official Plan documents, aerial photographs, land assessment records, agency contacts, field investigations, interviews, and published information					

Original Table 3 From Discussion Paper 3.5C

v4:d:wastemgt:eo90p21:efworgt3.xls

REVISED TABLE 3
CRITERIA FOR THE ASSESSMENT
OF THE LONG LIST OF CANDIDATE SITES TO
IDENTIFY A SHORT LIST OF CANDIDATE SITES (I.E., STEP 3)

Criteria Category	Human Health and Safety	Natural Environment	Social/Cultural	Economic/Financial	Technical	Legal/Jurisdictional
Criteria	o Effect of fugitive emissions (noise, odour, dust)	o Proximity to federally designated natural areas as defined by Canadian Parks Service o Proximity to provincially designated natural areas as defined by MNR o Proximity to municipally designated natural areas as defined in an official plan o Proximity to a life science ANSIs as defined by MNR o Proximity to surface water bodies capable of being cold or warm water fisheries, identifiable on a National Topographic Series Map (scale 1:50,000) o Proximity to provincially (Class 1 and 2) or regionally (Class 3) significant wetlands as defined by MNR o Proximity to areas with endangered species as identified by MNR or Environment Canada o Number, extent and significance of woodlots that would be cleared	o Number of businesses and residences that would be displaced by a Candidate EFW facility Site o Proximity to features of heritage value as defined in an official plan o Proximity to features of historical or architectural value designated or listed by a municipality o Proximity to features of historical value as designated by Canadian Parks Service o Proximity to features of archaeological value designated or listed by MCC o Proximity to features owned or controlled by the Ontario Heritage Foundation o Proximity to Indian reserves as defined by DIAND o Proximity to federal parks as defined by Canadian Parks Service o Proximity to provincial parks as defined by MNR o Proximity to municipal parks as designated in an official plan o Proximity to conservation areas as defined by a provincially designated conservation authority o Proximity to potentially affected farming activities o Proximity to sensitive land uses	o Site acquisition cost o Cost of mitigation required to reduce or eliminate all constraints identified	o Presence of underground and overhead facilities on a Candidate Site that may require displacement or elimination o Distance of a Candidate Site to sanitary sewers, water supply, gas supply, electrical supply and storm-water disposal facilities and adequacy of those facilities in relation to demands of an EFW facility	o Degree of difficulty in obtaining land use approvals having regard for local by-laws, provincial and federal laws and policies o Ease of site access for investigation purposes
Source of Information	o secondary source information, zoning and Official Plan documents, aerial photographs, land assessment records, agency contacts, field investigations, interviews, and published information					

v4:\d:\wastemgt\eo90p21\efwrevt3.xls

TABLE [illegible]

MANNER OF APPLICATION
OF STEP 3 HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY CRITERIA
TO IDENTIFY SHORT LIST OF EFW FACILITY CANDIDATE SITES

Human Health and Safety	Advantage	Neutral	Disadvantage	Rationale
(1) Effect of fugitive emissions (noise, odour, dust)	o Nearest residence is more than 470 m from site.	o Nearest residence is between 270 - 470 m from the site.	o Nearest residence is less than 270 m from the site.	o Distances of up to 270 m are judged equivalent to adjacent. In the absence of specific guidelines on minimum distance separation between EFW facilities and residences with respect to fugitive emissions, regard has been given to the following related MOE policies and guidelines: MOE (Central Region) document entitled "Buffers; Use and Design Guidelines", December 1981 states "A separation distance greater than 300 m" for "residential (up to) heavy industrial uses and other potentially non compatible uses is required". MOE policy document No. 07-07, "Guidelines for Land Use on or near Landfills and Dumps" states "The most significant adverse environmental effects to be normally within 500 m of a fill area".
Source of Information	o Secondary source information, zoning and Official Plan documents, aerial photographs, land assessment records, agency contacts, field investigations, interviews and published information			
Note	o Distances shown are measured from the boundaries of the EFW facility Candidate Site. There is a 30 m buffer between the EFW facility and the boundary of the Candidate Site.			

TABLE 3A.2

MANNER OF APPLICATION
OF STEP 3 NATURAL ENVIRONMENT CRITERIA
TO IDENTIFY SHORT LIST OF EFW FACILITY CANDIDATE SITES

Natural Environment	Advantage	Neutral	Disadvantage	Rationale
(1) Proximity to federally designated natural areas as designated by Canadian Parks Service (2) Proximity to provincially designated natural areas as defined by MNR	o Site is more than 970 m from a provincially of federally designated natural area.	o Site is between 470-970 m from a provincially of federally designated natural area.	o Site is 170-470 m from a provincially or federally designated natural area.	o Distances of up to 270 m are judged equivalent to adjacent. In the absence of specific guidelines on minimum distance separation between the EFW facilities and natural environmental features, regard has been given to the following MOE and MNR policies and guidelines: MOE (Central Region) document entitled "Buffers, Use and Design Guidelines", December 1981 states "A separation distance greater than 300 m" for "residential (up to) heavy industrial uses and other potentially non compatible uses is required". MOE policy document No. 07-07, "Guidelines for Land Use on or near Landfills and Dumps" states "The most significant adverse environmental effects to be normally within 500 m of a fill area". MNR Management Guidelines (Heronries) suggest a minimal impact beyond 1000 m. This is the greatest distance separation required for a species that is not endangered and thus represents a very conservative standard.
(3) Proximity to municipally designated natural areas as designated in an official plan	o Site is more than 970 m from municipally designated natural area	o Site is between 470-970 m from municipally designated natural area	o Site is 170-470 m from municipally designated natural area	o As per (1)
(4) Proximity to life science ANSI's as defined by MNR	o Site is more than 970 m from a life science ANSI	o Site is between 470-970 m from life science ANSI	o Site is 170-470 m from a life science ANSI	o As per (1)
(5) Proximity to suface water bodies capable of being a cold or warm water fishery identifiable on a National Topographic Series Map (scale 1:50,000)	o Site is more than 970 m from edge of surface water	o Site is between 470-970 m from edge of surface water	o Site is 170-470 m from edge of surface water	o As per (1)
(6) Proximity to provincially (Class 1 and 2) and regionally (Class 3) significant wetlands as defined by MNR	o Site is more than 970 m from wetland	o Site is between 470-970 m from wetland	o Site is 170-470 m from wetland	o As per (1)

Cont'd.....

TABLE 3A.2
MANNER OF APPLICATION
OF STEP 3 NATURAL ENVIRONMENT CRITERIA
TO IDENTIFY SHORT LIST OF EFW FACILITY CANDIDATE SITES

Natural Environment	Advantage	Neutral	Disadvantage	Rationale
(7) Proximity to areas with endangered species as identified by MNR or Environment Canada	o Site is more than 970 m from area of endangered species except where an existing MNR guideline provides for a greater setback. In this circumstance an advantage would be a site outside the MNR guideline setback.	o Site is between 470-970 m from the area of endangered species, except where an existing MNR guideline provides for a greater setback. In this circumstance a site inside the MNR setback is judged excluded under Step 2 criteria.	o Site is 170-470 m from area of endangered species, except when an existing MNR guideline provides for a greater setback. In this circumstance a site inside the MNR setback is judged excluded under Step 2 criteria.	o As per (1)
(8) Number, extent and significance of woodlots to be cleared	o No woodlot to be partially or completely cleared.	o Any woodlot which must be cleared, in whole or in part, is not significant*	o Site requires partial or complete clearance of one or more significant* woodlots	o Significant woodlots* will contain relatively unaffected areas in the interior parts which are relatively unaffected by woodlot edge impacts.
Source of Information	o Secondary source information, zoning and Official Plan documents, aerial photographs, land assessment records, agency contacts, field investigations, interviews and published information			
Notes	o Distances shown are measured from the boundaries of the EFW facility Candidate Site. There is a 30 M buffer between the EFW facility and the boundary of the Candidate Site. * A significant woodlot is greater than 4 ha in area and comprises later, more mature stages of plant succession and is over 75 years old.			

v4:d:\wastemgt\eo90p21\efwtc2.xls

TABLE 3A.3
MANNER OF APPLICATION
OF STEP 3 SOCIAL/CULTURAL CRITERIA
TO IDENTIFY SHORT LIST OF MRF CANDIDATE SITES

Social/Cultural	Advantage	Neutral	Disadvantage	Rationale
(1) Number of businesses and residences that would be displaced by a Canadidate MRF Site	o No business or residence displaced	o One business or residence displaced*	o More than one business or residence displaced*	o Since a MRF is a business, a MRF that replaces one business or residence is judged to be neutral. It is assumed at this time that an owner of a site, offered to Metro upon which there are any number of residences or businesses that will be displaced by the MRF, will have determined that "displacement" is not an issue (as far as the owner is concerned). Hence such a site will be rated as Advantage "no business or residence displaced".
(2) Proximity to features of heritage value as designated by an official plan	o Site is more than 490 m from feature	o Site is between 90 m and 490 m from feature	o Site is less than 90 m from feature	o Distances of up to 90 m from a feature are judged equivalent to adjacent. In the absence of specific guidelines on minimum distance separation between MRFs and specific land uses, regard has been given to the following related MOE policies and guidelines: MOE (Central Region) document entitled "Buffers; Use and Design Guidelines", December 1981 states "Separation distance(s) of 90 to 300 m between residential buildings and medium industrial use buildings are considered acceptable minimums". MOE policy document No. 07-07, "Guidelines for Land Use on or near Landfills and Dumps" states "The most significant adverse environmental effects to be normally within 500 m of a fill area".
(3) Proximity to features of historical or architectural value designated or listed by a municipality	o Site is more than 490 m from feature	o Site is between 90 m and 490 m from feature	o Site is less than 90 m from feature	o As per (2)
(4) Proximity to features of historical value as designated by Canadian Parks Service	o Site is more than 490 m from feature	o Site is between 90 m and 490 m from feature	o Site is less than 90 m from feature	o As per (2)

TABLE 3A.3

MANNER OF APPLICATION

OF STEP 3 SOCIAL/CULTURAL CRITERIA

TO IDENTIFY SHORT LIST OF EFW FACILITY CANDIDATE SITES

Social/Cultural	Advantage	Neutral	Disadvantage	Rationale
(5) Proximity to features of archaeological value designated or listed by MCC	o Site is more than 470 m from feature	o Site is between 270 m and 470 m from feature	o Site is less than 270 m from feature	o As per (2)
(6) Proximity to features owned or controlled by the Ontario Heritage Foundation	o Site is more than 470 m from feature	o Site is between 270 m and 470 m from feature	o Site is less than 270 m from feature	o As per (2)
(7) Proximity to Indian reserves as defined by DIAND	o Site is more than 470 m from feature	o Site is between 270 m and 470 m from feature	o Site is less than 270 m from feature	o As per (2)
(8) Proximity to federal parks as defined by Canadian Parks Service	o Site is more than 470 m from feature	o Site is between 270 m and 470 m from feature	o Site is less than 270 m from feature	o As per (2)
(9) Proximity to provincial parks ad defined by MNR	o Site is more than 470 m from feature	o Site is between 270 m and 470 m from feature	o Site is less than 270 m from feature	o As per (2)
(10) Proximity to municipal parks as designated on an official plan	o Site is more than 470 m from feature	o Site is between 270 m and 470 m from feature	o Site is less than 270 m from feature	o As per (2)
(11) Proximity to conservation areas as defined by a provincially designated conservation authority	o Site is more than 470 m from feature	o Site is between 270 m and 470 m from feature	o Site is less than 270 m from feature	o As per (2)
(12) Proximity to potentially affected farming activities	o Site is more than 470 m from boundary of nearest farm.	o Site is between 190 m and 470 m of boundary of nearest farm.	o Site is less than 190 m from boundary of nearest farm.	o As per (2). Regard has also been given to the OMAF*** Agricultural Code of Practice, 1978. The average calculation of minimum distance separation for standard livestock operations is approximately 220m. Therefore any distance less than 220m judged to be a Disadvantage.
(13) Proximity to sensitive land uses	o Site is more than 470 m from nearest sensitive land use. **	o Site is between 270 m and 470 m from nearest sensitive land use. **	o Site is less than 270 m from nearest sensitive land use. **	o As per (2)
Source of Information	o Secondary source information, zoning and Official Plan documents, aerial photographs, land assessment records, agency contacts, field investigations, interviews and published information			
Notes	o Distances shown are measured from the boundaries of the EFW facility Candidate Site. There is a 30 M buffer between the EFW facility and the boundary of the Candidate Site. * Does not apply to land offered to Metro - see rationale for (1) ** Sensitive land uses are defined as: cemeteries and educational, medical and residential uses. *** Ontario Ministry of Agriculture and Food			

v4:d:\wastemgt\eo90p21\sfwtc3.xls

TABLE 3A.4
MANNER OF APPLICATION
OF STEP 3 ECONOMIC/FINANCIAL CRITERIA
TO IDENTIFY SHORT LIST OF EFW FACILITY CANDIDATE SITES

Economic/Financial	Advantage	Neutral	Disadvantage	Rationale
(1) Site acquisition cost	o Below $1,000,000 per hectare.	o $1,000,000-$1,700,000 per hectare.	o Above $1,700,000 per hectare.	o General industrial land costs in Metro range from $1,000,000-$1,700,000 per hectare. Prime sites are more expensive. Land costs below Metro general industrial costs are judged to be an advantage.
(2) Cost of mitigation required to reduce or eliminate all constraints identified	o Costs of mitigation up to $1 million.	o Costs of mitigation between $1-2 million.	o Costs of mitigation more than $2 million.	o Site is more economically attractive when mitigation costs are low. Costs of over 10% of cost of an EFW facility is judged disadvantage.
Source of information	o Secondary source information, zoning and Official Plan documents, aerial photographs, land assessment records, agency contacts, field investigations, interviews and published information			

v4:d:\wastemgt\eo90p21\efwtc4.xls

TABLE 3A.5
MANNER OF APPLICATION
OF STEP 3 TECHNICAL CRITERIA
TO IDENTIFY SHORT LIST OF EFW FACILITY CANDIDATE SITES

Technical	Advantage	Neutral	Disadvantage	Rationale
(1) Presence of underground and overhead facilities on a Candidate EFW facility Site that may require displacement or elimination	o No utility facilities requiring relocation.	o Presence of two minor * utility facilities providing services to others requiring relocation.	o Site has three or more minor * utility facilities providing services to others requiring relocation; or site has one or more major * utility facilities providing services to others requiring relocation.	o Rerouting utility facilities providing services to others is costly and causes disruption to customers. Relocation of some major * utility facilities may not be reasonable or feasible.
(2) Distance of a Candidate EFW facility Site to sanitary sewers, water supply, gas supply, electrical supply and stormwater disposal facilities and adequacy of those facilities in relation to demands of an EFW facility	o Adequate services are within 0.5 km of site.	o Adequate services are within 2 km of site.	o Adequate services are more than 2 km from the site.	o Service connection costs are lower when the site is close to existing services o Upgrading of services adds to cost and complexity
Source of Information	o Secondary source information, zoning and Official Plan documents, aerial photographs, land assessment records, agency contacts, field investigations, interviews, and published information.			
Notes	o * Minor utility facilities are sewers up to 750 mm diameter, watermains up to 300 mm diameter, gas mains up to 300 mm diameter, electrical distribution systems up 100 kv, and telecommunication facilities for up to 1000 persons. o * Major utility facilities are oil pipelines and sewers, watermains, gas mains, electric distribution systems and telecommunication systems of larger capacity than minor systems.			

v4:d:\wastemgt\eo90p21\efwtc5.xls

TABLE 3A.6

MANNER OF APPLICATION
OF STEP 3 LEGAL/JURISDICTIONAL CRITERIA
TO IDENTIFY SHORT LIST OF EFW FACILITY CANDIDATE SITES

Legal/Jurisdictional	Advantage	Neutral	Disadvantage	Rationale
(1) Degree of difficulty in obtaining land use approvals, having regard for local by-laws, provincial and federal laws and policies	o Site is industrially zoned and designated as industrial in the appropriate official plan, and there is no evidence as of December 15, 1990 of a municipal intention to change the permitted land use to a different designation, or site is located on provincial or federal land with no applicable land use constraints.	o Site is either industrially zoned or designated as industrial in the appropriate official plan and there is no evidence as of December 15, 1990 of a municipal intention to change the permitted land use to a different designation.	o Site is either not zoned and not designated as industrial in the appropriate official plan or there is evidence as of December 15, 1990 of a municipal intention to change the land use from the industrial designation to a different designation or site is located on provincial or federal land with an applicable land use constraint.	o Site on land where land use designation is close to the proposed use will experience less difficulty with approvals for land use designation changes.
(2) Ease of site access for site investigation purposes	o Metro owned surplus land or Metro Works controlled land.	o Land offered to Metro.	o Land other than Metro owned surplus land and Metro Works' controlled land or land offered to Metro.	o Access for investigation purposes is easier to acquire for Metro owned land and offered land.
Source of Information	o Secondary source information, zoning and Official Plan documents, aerial photographs, land assessment records, agency contacts, field investigations, interviews, and published information			

v4:\d:\wastemgt\ec90p21\efwtc6.xls

A5.0 APPLICATION OF STEP 3 CRITERIA

The objective of Step 3 is to produce a short list of Candidate Sites from a long list of Candidate Sites by assessing the relative advantages and disadvantages of establishing a facility at each of the Candidate Sites on the long list. The assessment uses the criteria set out on Revised Table 3.

Each Candidate Site on the long list will be assigned a rating of "advantage", "neutral" or "disadvantage" relative to each criterion shown on Revised Table 3A, applied in the manner described in Tables 3A.1 - 3A.6. The sites with the most "disadvantage" ratings will be eliminated, one at a time, until there is a reasonable number of reasonable sites or until there are no sites with "disadvantage" ratings. In the former case, these sites will constitute the short list of Candidate Sites. In the latter case, where there is more than a reasonable number of reasonable sites, sites with the most "neutral" ratings will be eliminated one at a time, until there is a reasonable number of reasonable sites or until there are no sites with "neutral" ratings. In the former case, these sites will constitute the short list of Candidate Sites. In the latter case, even where there remain more than a reasonable number of reasonable sites, these sites will constitute the short list of Candidate Sites because all remaining sites will have only "advantage" ratings and cannot be further assessed using Step 3 criteria.

FIGURE A1
NEW STEP 3 CRITERIA WHICH ARE ADDED IN REVISED TABLE 3

Criterion		Rationale For Addition
Natural Environment		
(1)	Proximity to a federally designated natural area as defined by Canadian Parks Service	Added to be consistent with the Natural Environment criterion added to Revised Table 2A and Revised Table 2B.
(2)	Proximity to a provincially designated natural area as defined by MNR	See (1) above
(3)	Proximity to municipally designated natural area	See (1) above
(4)	Proximity to surface water body capable of being a warm or cold water fishery	See (1) above. This criterion also replaces the criterion in Table 3 entitled "Proximity to designated flood areas".
(5)	Proximity to a provincially (Class 1 and 2) or regionally (Class 3) significant wetland	See (1) above
(6)	Proximity to areas with endangered species	See (1) above
Social/Cultural		
(1)	Number of businesses and residences that would be disrupted by an EFW facility on a Candidate Site	This criterion was to be applied by identifying the number of businesses located on the streets within 500 m of the site. It was concluded that traffic effects could be more effectively addressed by the Human Health and Safety criterion identified in Revised Table 2A and Revised Table 2B. A further analysis of business disruption will be carried out in Step 4 of the site selection process.
(2)	Proximity to features of heritage value as designated by an official plan	Added to be consistent with the Social/Cultural criterion added to Revised Table 2A and Revised Table 2B
(3)	Proximity to features of historical or architectural value designated or listed by a municipality	See (2) above

FIGURE A1 (Cont'd)
NEW STEP 3 CRITERIA WHICH ARE ADDED IN REVISED TABLE 3

Criterion		Rationale For Addition
Social/Cultural (Cont'd)		
(4)	Proximity to features of historical value as designated by Canadian Parks Service	See (2) above
(5)	Proximity to features of archaeological value designated or listed by MCC	See (2) above
(6)	Proximity to features owned or controlled by the Ontario Heritage Foundation	See (2) above
(7)	Proximity to Indian reserves as defined by DIAND	Added to be consistent with the Land Use criterion added to Revised Table 2A and Revised Table 2B
(8)	Proximity to federal parks as defined by Parks Canada	See (7) above
(9)	Proximity to provincial parks as defined by MNR	See (7) above
(10)	Proximity to municipal parks as designated on an official plan	See (7) above
(11)	Proximity to conservation areas as defined by a provincially designated conservation authority	See (7) above
Economic/Financial		
(1)	Cost of mitigation required to reduce or eliminate all constraints identified	Removed from Technical, and modified to indicate only "cost", and added to Economic/Financial.
Legal/Jurisdictional		
(1)	Ease of site access for site investigation purposes	Added to recognise that a site search can be severely hampered (i.e. made longer and more expensive) if access for investigation purposes is not obtained in a timely manner.

FIGURE A2
STEP 3 CRITERIA IN TABLE 3, DISCUSSION PAPER 3.5C
WHICH ARE DELETED IN REVISED TABLE 3

Criterion		Rationale For Deletion
Human Health & Safety		
(1)	Effect of traffic changes on injury and non-injury accident rates	Addressed by the Human Health and Safety criterion in Revised Table 2A and Revised Table 2B. See section A2.0 of this Addendum.
(2)	Effect of noise, odour and dust	Replaced by Human Health and Safety criterion in Revised Table 3 entitled "Effect of fugitive emissions (noise, odour and dust)".
(3)	Distance from designated flight paths of licensed airports as defined by the Federal Department of Transport	Proximity to designated flight paths should be evaluated on a site specific basis. This criterion can better be addressed in the Step 4 comparative evaluation.
Natural Environment		
(1)	Proximity to earth science areas of natural and scientific interest (ANSI)	There is no expected impact from the EFW facility beyond the distance shown in Table 2C.
(2)	Proximity to designated flood plain areas	Replaced by the Natural Environment criterion for surface water capable of being a cold or warm water fishery in Revised Table 2A and Revised Table 2B.
(3)	Proximity to environmentally sensitive areas	Addressed by the Natural Environment criteria of "Proximity to municipal, provincially or federally designated natural areas" and "Proximity to municipally designated natural areas" in Revised Table 3.
(4)	Proximity to natural resource areas	There is no expected impact from the EFW facility beyond the distance shown in Table 2C.

FIGURE A2 (Cont'd)
STEP 3 CRITERIA IN TABLE 3, DISCUSSION PAPER 3.5C
WHICH ARE DELETED IN REVISED TABLE 3

Criterion		Rationale For Deletion
Social/Cultural		
(1)	Number of businesses and residences that would be disrupted by an EFW facility on a Candidate Site	This criterion was to be applied by identifying the number of businesses located on the streets within 500 m of the site. It was concluded that traffic effects could be more effectively addressed by the Human Health and Safety criterion identified in Revised Table 2A and Revised Table 2B. A further analysis of business disruption will be carried out in Step 4 of the site selection process.
(2)	Impact of EFW facility related traffic upon areas adjacent to traffic routes	This criterion was to be applied by identifying the number of businesses and residences located on the streets within 500 m of the site. It was concluded that traffic effects could be more effectively addressed by the Human Health and Safety criterion identified in Revised Table 2A and Revised Table 2B.
(3)	Proximity to major recreational activities	In Revised Table 2A and Revised Table 2B, Land Use, sites within designated conservation areas, federal provincial or municipal parks were eliminated. To ensure clarity and consistency in the application of this criterion, it has been reworked in Revised Table 3 to include areas adjacent to regional private and public recreational areas as well as designated public parks.
(4)	Distance from sensitive land uses as defined by MOE.	Replaced by "Proximity to sensitive land uses". Reference to MOE was deleted since MOE has no definition of sensitive land uses.
Economic/Financial		
(1)	Distance of Candidate EFW facility Site from the location of solid waste generation	This criterion will be addressed in Step 4 of the site selection process.

FIGURE A2 (Cont'd)
STEP 3 CRITERIA IN TABLE 3, DISCUSSION PAPER 3.5C
WHICH ARE DELETED IN REVISED TABLE 3

Criterion		Rationale For Deletion
Economic/Financial (Cont'd)		
(2)	Proximity of Provincial highways, Metro arterial roads, county or regional roads to a Candidate Site	See rationale for (1) above.
(3)	Length and cost of access road requiring construction/improvement to serve the EFW facility located on Candidate Site	Within Metro access road requirements are expected to be minimal based on Revised Table 2A and Revised Table 2B, Human Health and Safety criterion. This is a comparative criterion and will be addressed in Step 4.
(4)	Proximity to energy customer or feasible point of input to electrical power grid relative to a Candidate Site	Step 2 criteria revised provides for site choices that will be adjacent to or close to a feasible point of input to an electrical power grid and hence is a giver for all sites and hence not a comparative criterion.
Technical		
(1)	Feasibility, means and cost of mitigation required to reduce or eliminate all constraints identified	Replaced by Economic/Financial criterion. "Cost of mitigation required to reduce or eliminate all constraints identified". "feasibility" and "means" were deleted since the Environmental Assessment Act requires that means of mitigation be considered in assessing the advantages and disadvantages of potential sites. Thus these terms are given in the analyses; they are not variables. It is the costs of the methods of mitigation that will vary from site to site. Costs are thus a basis for judging "advantage", "disadvantage" or "neutral".

FIGURE A2 (Cont'd)
STEP 3 CRITERIA IN TABLE 3, DISCUSSION PAPER 3.5C
WHICH ARE DELETED IN REVISED TABLE 3

Criterion	Rationale For Deletion
Legal/Jurisdictional	
(1) Degree of difficulty in obtaining approvals having regard for local by-laws, provincial and federal laws and policies	Replaced by the Legal/Jurisdictional criterion of "Degree of difficulty in obtaining land use approvals having regard for local by-laws, provincial and federal laws and policies". The original intent of this criterion was to focus on land use approvals. This is consistent with the approach taken in Step 1 and Step 2 and their focus on land use designations and zoning as a guide to screening for appropriate buffers.

D:\MASTENGT\EO90P21\EPM2-D11.JW